This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Per 11144 e 80
b.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY:

A JOURNAL OF

THEOLOGICAL AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

VOLUME VI.

LONDON:
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1872.

PRINTED BY
JOHN KEATES, CHEAPSIDE, HANLEY,
STAFFORDSHIRE.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VI.

No. I.

	PAGE
The Speaker's Commentary	1
Human Power in the Divine Life	11
Methodist New Connexion Magazine for January, 1872	20
The Unity of the Church	33
A People's Blue-book	43
Modern Scepticism	60
Dr. Cooke's Sermons	66
Notices of Books	73
Recent Publications, &c.	86

No. II.

The Resurrection of the Dead—Part II.	89
Work and Wages	110
Position and Prospects of the Free Churches	120
Christian Theism	147
First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth	157
Notices of Books	169

No. III.

Jesus and the Common People	173
Hymns, their Authorship and History	185
The Church of Scotland	218
Popular Preaching	231
Faith and Fellowship	241
Notice of Book	250

No. IV.

Hierarchism; or, the Religion of the Priest	253
Short Essays	261
Henry Ward Beecher on Preaching	282
The Smaller Denominations	297
The Alliance and the Liberal Party	320
Methodical Evangelism	327
Notices of Books	332

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

WITH the issue of this number, which completes the sixth volume, the publication of the METHODIST QUARTERLY will be discontinued. The Managers, in making this announcement, tender their true and earnest thanks to the friends who have so kindly given their sympathy and aid in the undertaking. To the Contributors, especially, their acknowledgements are due, for the generous way in which they have placed their productions at their disposal. It would be vain to deny that there has been considerable anxiety felt in conducting this journal, but that has been more than counterbalanced by the pleasure realized from intercourse with those whose acquaintance and friendship it has secured. But our condition here is one of inevitable vicissitude, and to readers, friends, and contributors, we give an affectionate—FAREWELL.

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY.

MARCH, 1872.

ART. 1.—THE SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY.

The Holy Bible, according to the authorised version (A.D. 1611), with an explanatory and critical commentary and a revision of the translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. 1, The Pentateuch. London: John Murray. 1871.

The New Bible Commentary, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church, critically examined. By the Right Rev. J. W. COLENSO, D.D., Bishop of Natal. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1871.

OF late years the text of the sacred canon has been subjected to the most searching critical analysis. Every discovery in modern science and every new position in philosophy have been pressed into service in the endeavour to prove that the sacred Record is untrustworthy. Geology and astronomy, philology and ethnology, and almost every other branch of scientific or philosophical literature, have been summoned to witness against the Bible, and the faith of many has been shaken, whilst the minds of more still have been sadly bewildered. It was in view of this that Mr. Denison, the late Speaker of the House of Commons, proposed, nearly eight years ago, to some of the Bishops of the Anglican Church to issue a commentary on the Bible, which, by its plain and practical style, would suit people of ordinary education, and yet should, by its learning, fairly represent the advanced stage of Biblical criticism and scientific truth which we have

reached. The first instalment of this great work is before us, and we propose to give a brief statement of its nature, rather by way of supplying our readers with information than for the sake of indulging in criticism.

The general editor of the work is the Rev. F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter, who previously had won a fair position as an expositor of Sacred Writ by his excellent commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.

The general introduction to the Pentateuch, and also the introduction and notes to the Book of Genesis, are supplied by Dr. Harold Browne, Bishop of Ely, whose controversial fairness, sound scholarship, and intellectual acuteness, have been acknowledged for many years, even by those who have been opposed to him in opinion.

The introduction to the Book of Exodus and the notes to the 19th chapter are written by the editor. The remainder of the notes to the Book of Exodus, and the introduction and notes to the Book of Leviticus, are written by the Rev. S. Clark, M.A., Vicar of Bradwardine, and these are perhaps the most learned, but from the dogmatic style indulged in, the least attractive parts of the volume.

The introduction and most of the notes on the Book of Numbers are written by the Rev. T. E. Espin, B.D., Rector of Wallasey, who also has supplied the introduction and notes to the Book of Deuteronomy. Some of the notes on the Book of Numbers were written by the late Rev. J. F. Thrupp, M.A., to whom the whole Book was relegated, but death interrupted him in his pious labours.

A very valuable part of the volume are the numerous *excursi* on important matters in the Sacred Text, which could not be adequately discussed in the notes, and which are given at the end of various chapters. There are twelve of these short essays supplied by Bishop Browne on the Book of Genesis, one by Canon Cook, on the former part of the Book of Exodus, thirty-one by Mr. Clark on the latter part of the Book of Exodus and the Book of Leviticus, and thirty-nine by Mr. Espin on the Books of Numbers and Deuteronomy. Besides these there are three longer essays by the editor on more general topics. That our readers may have some idea of the nature of these *excursi*, we give the titles appended to those in the Book of Genesis. *On the Days of Creation—On the Creation and Primitive State of Man—On the effects of the Fall—On the Historical character of the Temptation and Fall—Cherubim—On the Early Civilisation of Mankind—Difficulties in the Chronology of chapter* 5*—The Deluge—On*

Circumcision—The Dead Sea—On the Chronology of Jacob's Life—On Shiloh. Not less attractive and important are the subjects of those attached to the remaining books of the Pentateuch.

The book commences with a carefully written introduction to the Pentateuch by Bishop Browne. The positions he occupies and seeks to establish are the following:—

1. That Moses could have written the Pentateuch.
2. That the concurrent testimony of all subsequent times proves that he did write the Pentateuch.
3. That the internal evidences points to him, and to him only, as the writer of the Pentateuch.

At the same time Bishop Browne claims that the following allowances be made:—

(a) It is not necessary to insist that every word of the Pentateuch was written down by the hand of Moses in his own autograph. He may have dictated much or all of it to Joshua, or to some secretary or scribe. He may have merely superintended its writing, and stamped it with his own authority.

(b) It is not necessary to deny that the Pentateuch, though the work of the great Prophet and lawgiver whose name it bears, may have undergone some revision in after times by Ezra or others. The Jews hold that all the books of the Old Testament were submitted by Ezra and the Great Synagogue to a careful review.

(c) It is not necessary to deny that Moses had certain documents or traditions referring to the patriarchal ages, which he incorporated into his history. Indeed it is most likely that such traditions should have come down through Shem and Abraham to Joseph and the Israelites in Egypt: and there can be no reason why an inspired historian should not have worked up such trustworthy materials with the history of the ancestors of his people.

These arguments and positions Bishop Browne enlarges upon with great force and clearness, showing in his treatment of them ripe and sound learning. On his development of the argument we cannot enlarge, but the following paragraph is so excellent that our readers will thank us for it.

The Relation of Moses to the Hebrew Language.

"It is argued that the language of the Pentateuch, although in some few fragments apparently archaic, is for the most part too like the later Hebrew for us to believe that it came from Moses. To this it might be replied that this is really what we might expect. A

language is fixed by its great and especially by its popular authors. It is commonly said that English has been fixed by Shakespeare and the translators of the Bible. Moses, putting aside all questions of inspiration, was a man of extraordinary powers and opportunity. If he was not divinely guided and inspired as all Christians believe, he must have been even a greater genius than he has been generally reckoned. He had had the highest cultivation possible in one of Egypt's most enlightened times; and after his early training in science and literature he had lived the contemplative life of a shepherd in Midian. We find him then, with a full consciousness of his heavenly mission, coming forth as legislator, historian, poet, as well as prince and prophet. Such a man could not but mould the tongue of his people. To them he was Homer, Solon, and Thucydides, all in one. Everyone that knew anything of letters must have known the books of the Pentateuch. All Hebrew literature, as far as we know, was of a sacred character, at all events no other has come down to us; and it is certain that writers on sacred subjects would have been deeply imbued with the language and the thoughts of Moses. Eastern languages, like eastern manners, are slow of change; and there is certainly nothing strange in our finding that in the thousand years from Moses to Malachi, the same tongue was spoken and the same words intelligible; especially in books treating on the same subjects, and where the earlier books must have been the constant study of all the writers down to the very last. It is said on the authority of Freytag, that the inhabitants of Mecca still speak the pure language of the Koran, written 1,200 years ago. Egyptian papyri, with an interval of 1,000 years between them, are said by Egyptologists to exhibit no change of language or of grammar. We must not reason about such nations as the Israelites, with their comparative isolation and fixedness, from the Exodus to the Captivity, on the same principles as we should think of the peoples of modern Europe, where so many elements of change have conspired to alter and to mould their language and their literature. The language of the Pentateuch, then, is just what the language of Moses would probably have been, simple, forcible, with archaic forms and expressions, but, having formed and stamped all future language, still readily intelligible to the last."—pp. 18, 19.

Passing by the well written and important introduction to the Book of Genesis, which deals at considerable length with the names of God as used in the book, we propose to present two or three of Bishop Browne's comments, taken almost at random, and not more excellent than a hundred others, as specimens of his mode of exposition.

The Fashion of the Ark.

"The actual form of the Ark is not described. The proportions only are given, which are not very different from those of the 'Great

Eastern.' Reckoning the cubit at 21 inches, the proportions would be, length, 525 feet, breadth, 87 feet 6 inches, height, 52 feet 6 inches; those of the 'Great Eastern' being, length, 680 feet, breadth, 83 feet, depth, 58 feet. The length of the cubit is doubtful, as there appears to have been two or three different measures so called. In all probability it means the length from the elbow to the end of the hand, a variable measure of course, but sufficiently accurate for the purposes of those simple times. It is mentioned by the German commentators that Peter Jansen, in 1609, built a vessel of the same proportions as the Ark, though smaller, viz.: length, 120 feet, width, 20 feet, depth, 12 feet. It was found most convenient for stowage, containing one third more freight than ordinary vessels of the same tonnage, though it was unsuited for making way quickly through the water. John Temporarius, quoted by Heidegger, made a curious calculation, according to which the Ark would have afforded abundant room for all the animals then known, and food for their voyage. Tiele, also, in his commentary, calculates that there was room for 7,000 distinct species.'—pp. 67, 88.

Esau Bartering his Birthright.

"It is doubtful what privileges the birthright carried with it in patriarchal times. In after-times a double portion of the patrimony was assigned to the first-born by law; but in the earliest days the respect paid to the eldest son is very apparent; and as the family spread out into a tribe, the patriarchal head became a chieftain or prince. It also looks as if the head of the family exercised a kind of priesthood. Then the father's chief blessing was given to his first-born son. Above all, in the family of Abraham, there was a promise of peculiar spiritual privileges, which, if not fully understood, would have been much dwelt upon by believing minds. All this was to Esau of little account compared with the desire of present gratification of appetite. It has been thought, not improbably, that the famine impending was already more or less pressing on the family of Isaac. Esau had perhaps been seeking food in vain, whilst Jacob had prepared a mess of pottage sufficient to relieve the pains of hunger. If it were so, Esau, wearied and famished, may have been strongly tempted to give up much for food. But his worldly and 'profane' character is exhibited in his contempt for that which was, whether in a worldly or in a spiritual point of view, rather an object of faith or sentiment than of sight and sense. Jacob, a man of widely different character, had probably looked with reverence on the spiritual promises, though with culpable ambition for the personal pre-eminence of the first-born. He and Esau were twins, and it may have seemed hard to him to be shut out from the chief hope of his house by one not older than himself, and whose character was little worthy of his position. This may be some excuse for his conduct, but the sacred history, whilst exposing the carnal indifference of Esau, does not extenuate the selfishness of Jacob. Throughout

their history, Esau is the bold, reckless, but generous and openhearted man of this world. Jacob, on the contrary, is a thoughtful, religious man, but with many infirmities, and especially with that absence of simplicity and uprightness which often characterises those who have made their choice of heaven, and yet let their hearts linger too much on earth."—P. 157.

Canon Cook, the general editor of the work, very well sustains his character as a thoughtful, painstaking, and erudite expositor of the Bible, by his commentary on the former part of the Book of Exodus. In connection with the great events treated of in his province he supplies two essays on the bearings of Egyptian history on the Pentateuch. Notwithstanding the careful study and research the essays manifest, we are obliged to say that Canon Cook is not able to obtain any clear testimony from monumental documents which throws light on Biblical history. His comments are exceedingly valuable and interesting, but the most helpful contribution made by him is the essay on "The Route of the Israelites from Rameses to Sinai," which gathers up in a succinct and comprehensive manner the results of researches made in the Western district of Sinai by Captains Wilson and Palmer, and the Rev. F. W. Holland. To give even a summary of this essay would occupy too much of our space, but to the Biblical student it is of great value. We subjoin one brief comment by Canon Cook.

THE SONG OF MOSES.

Exod. xv. 1-18.—*Introductory Remarks.*—"With the deliverance of Israel is associated the development of the national poetry, which finds its first and perfect expression in this magnificent hymn. It is said to have been sung by Moses and the people, an expression which evidently points to him as the author. That it was written at the time is an assertion expressly made in the text, and it is supported by the strongest internal evidence. The style is admitted even by critics who question its genuineness, to be achaic both in the language, which is equally remarkable for grandeur and severe simplicity, and in the general structure, which, though rhythmical and systematic, differs materially from later compositions, in which the divisions are more numerous and the arrangement more elaborate. The subject matter and the leading thoughts are such as belong to the time and the occasion; unlike the later Psalms, the song abounds in allusions to incidents passing under the eye of the composer; it has every mark of freshness and originality. The only objections are founded on the prophetic portion (15-17); but if ever there was a crisis calculated to elicit the spirit of prophecy, it was that of the Exodus; if ever a man fitted to express that spirit it was Moses. Even objectors admit that the invasion of Palestine was contem-

plated by Moses; if so, what more natural than after the great catastrophe, which they accept as an historical fact, he should anticipate the terror of the nations through whose territories the Israelties would pass, and whose destruction was an inevitable condition of their success? In every age this song gave the tone to the poetry of Israel, especially at great critical epochs of deliverance. In the book of Revelation (15-3) it is associated with the final triumph of the Church, when the saints 'having the harps of God' will sing 'the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb.' The division of the song into three parts is distinctly marked, 1-5, 6-10, 11-18; each begins with an ascription of praise to God; each increases in length and varied imagery unto the triumphant close."

The very elaborate and learned contribution of the Rev. S. Clark, M.A., offers a great deal of food for study, and is very instructive. He enters into details with a minuteness and heartiness which sometimes quite exhaust the subject, and quotes authorities and opinions with a facility which is quite wonderful. At the same time there is somewhat of ostentation in the style, which, in a measure, mars the effect upon the mind. The notes and *excursi* upon "the Leprosy" present the most complete discussion of the subject we have seen; those on "clean and unclean food" are also very full and thoughtful. In seeking to account for the differences between the statements of the decalogue, as recorded in Exod. xx. and Deut v., Mr. Clark boldly states the opinion, also held by Ewald, that neither really contains the genuine ten commandments as uttered by Jehovah, but that they originally were a briefer statement; that is, the bare commands were only given in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 10th commands, and the details were subsequently incorporated by Moses in the words spoken by God, when he was instructed to write the words of the law for the future use of the nation. This solution of the difficulty we must hesitate to accept, and also his suggestion that the variation in the words "remember" and "keep," as given in the two books, is the error of a copyist. It will be safe for us to wait a better explanation of the variations than to receive this, which might lead us to other unwarrantable suppositions.

It is not a little refreshing and instructive to find Mr. Clark advancing opinions on the vexed question of "marriage with a deceased wife's sister," which are totally at issue with those expressed by the bench of bishops in successive sessions of Parliament. In arguing the matter, in a lengthy essay "On the list of prohibited degrees," he says concerning the oft quoted passage, Lev. xviii., 18, "The rule, as it here stands, would seem to bear no other meaning than that a man is not

to form a connection with his wife's sister while his wife is alive. It appears to follow that the law permitted marriage with the sister of a deceased wife. A limitation being expressly laid down in the words 'beside the other in her life time,' it may be inferred that when the limitation is removed, the prohibition loses its force, and permission is implied." It is not a little strange that an admission like this should be made by a commentator in a work published under the special auspices of a church which has for so long taken so completely opposite a course, and it is very creditable to the boldness and independence of Mr. Clark.

Concerning the remaining part of the Commentary we can say that it is only more homely in style than the preceding parts, and is more readable than Mr. Clark's, as being less interlarded by authorities, and indicating that Mr. Espin has made more use of a strong native sagacity than of abstruse lore in exercising his skill in exposition. His style is singularly expressive and clear, and, on the whole, his contribution is as welcome as those preceding. There are certain peccadillos in the work as might be expected; *e.g.*, we are twice told that the Sacred Text is given *literatim et verbatim* from the version of 1611, and yet we find many words printed in italics in the Speaker's commentary which are given in the Bible of 1611 in Romaic. There are also many variations in the marginal readings and references, some of which are no doubt improvements, but do not agree with the above assertion. Then sometimes opinions are advanced which cannot very well be substantiated, and which, indeed, do not affect the general arguments of the work in one direction or another. Bishop Browne states "that it was the belief of all Jewish antiquity that Moses was the author and writer of the Pentateuch," an assertion which is incapable of proof, and against which a great deal might be said. The sentence simply needs a little qualification.

But the defects in the work are so slight, and the excellencies are so numerous, that it is an unpleasant thing to speak of drawbacks at all. If we must, as was only to be expected, reckon a few faulty translations, questionable positions, and antiquated opinions, there is so much to be said in praise that these things seem too insignificant to be dwelt upon. The book, taken altogether, is an immense advance upon everything of the kind that has yet appeared in our literature. The writers so well combine solid learning, reverent spirit, religious fervour, and judicial calmness, and have taken such advantage of scientific discoveries, Eastern research, and

Biblical criticism, that they have produced an exposition of the Pentateuch which stands at the head of this department of our literature. The writers, unlike many previous commentators, who pass by the difficult and only seek to explain the easy parts of Scripture, have sought particularly to expound those portions which have been specially prominent in the discussions of recent years, and, therefore, questions relating to the Creation, the Fall, the Early Civilisations, the Social system of the Jews, &c., receive specific and lengthy consideration.

A few remarks must now suffice upon the second work which stands at the head of this paper, but we can do no more than characterise it in general terms.

At the outset we would emphatically protest against the style of literary controversy which is preserved throughout this pamphlet. From first to last it abounds with epithets, charges, and bold assertions. Indeed, it is a disgrace to an age which has considerably outlived the coarse and vulgar abuse indulged in by critics and controversialists of the last century. In the course of about twelve lines, on pp. 10, 11, the following charges are preferred against Bishop Browne, a man whom his country and church honour for his scholarship and calmness of mind:—"carelessness," "inconsistency," "loose inaccuracy of statement," "unsound, unscientific, extravagant, often absurd reasoning," "rash, uncritical, often puerile, judgment, defective acquaintance with the results of modern criticism, and evasion of well-known difficulties." This is a pretty cluster of rhetorical flowers to be presented by one Bishop of the Church of the Lord Jesus to a brother Bishop. Then, throughout the book, similar phrases may be extracted almost from every page. On p. 4, we find the words—"little dependence can be placed on the sobriety, soundness, and carefulness of his criticisms;" there is "inaccuracy and looseness of reasoning generally in his criticisms." "Bishop Browne's habitual inaccuracy"—p. 9. "Bishop Browne travels in the same jaunty fashion over the Books of Samuel"—p. 10. "Is it possible that such solemn nonsense can be penned in this age by a Bishop of the Church of England?"—p. 101. "He is bringing the English Church into contempt by such ineptitudes"—p. 102. Such terms of scorn and assumption of superiority run through the whole pamphlet, and do not raise one's opinion of the man, Bishop though he be, who can so freely indulge in them. Then the boldness of assertion on the part of Bishop Colenso fairly takes away one's breath. He calmly assumes the correctness of his own *ipse dixit*, and expects it to be received by

all with equal confidence. Hence we have many of the facts of the Pentateuch disposed of by such curt sentences as these:—"This is part of the fiction which ascribes this Law to Moses"—p. 5. "This also is part of the fiction in Deuteronomy"—p. 5. "The story of the prophet Daniel at the Court of Darius is a pure fiction"—p. 83. "There is something very solemn and impressive in the *grand old myth*, with the ark and its human and brute inhabitants, floating along," &c.—p. 102. Such are specimens of the cool assumptions of Bishop Colenso in disposing of statements and documents which are the most cherished in the world, and on which it has been the pride of the ripest scholars to hang their votive offerings. No wonder our sensibilities take offence at the whole tone and style of the book, and that we rank it as unworthy in these respects of the subject and of a professedly Christian minister.

The criticisms, however, in respect of their soundness would be shewn to be untrustworthy by a little examination. According to the most able rationalist critics, Bishop Colenso is not correct even in distinguishing between the supposed Elohistic and Jehovistic parts of the Pentateuch; as for instance on p. 131, he states in correction of Bishop Browne that Gen. xxv., 1—6, 11, is Jehovistic, whereas it is claimed by other rationalists to be Elohistic.

Bishop Colenso says, "It is probable that the Israelites left Egypt under some energetic leader, and possible that he was a man of Egyptian learning, such as 'Osarsiph, priest of Heliopolis,' in Manetho's story" (6 p); and then affirms the want of evidence to show that Moses was brought up in the house of Pharoah, or even that he was a Hebrew at all; thus evidencing greater reliance on the fragment of Manetho than on the story of Scripture. He also affirms that any traditions which had come down to Moses could have had no historical value, as "we know how traditions are modified which have passed through even two or three hands."—(7 p). Whereas we have numerous instances on record in which traditions have been preserved and handed down for many generations, without any material alteration even of language; and Max Müller, than whom there could be no greater authority, has given examples of this. But assertions like these exist on every page.

Our author makes it somewhat difficult to deal with his pamphlet, by referring the reader at every point to his volumes of criticisms on the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua; and this effusion is made by this means little other than an advertisement of the works which have gained him such notoriety. Indeed to examine his theory, well-worn by this time, would

simply require that the six volumes of his work should be criticised. To do this is not our object, and we must be content at present with expressing our steady aversion to all books written with such flippancy, such presumption, such strange *animus*, and such recklessness of assertion, as is this pamphlet.

W. J. TOWNSEND.

ART. II.—HUMAN POWER IN THE DIVINE LIFE.

Human Power in the Divine Life: or, The Active Powers of the Mind in Relation to Religion. By Rev. NICHOLAS BISHOP, M.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1871.

AFTER due consideration, there seems to us to be a special reason why the author of this book should state the design of it for himself. The title of the book is somewhat expressive on this point, but the first words of the preface make it much clearer. "The design of the present work is to consider the active powers of the mind in their relation to the Divine life, their adaptation to the requirements of the Divine Law, and to the sense of human responsibility." After writing thus, our author goes on to speak of the practical importance of the subject, because "nothing can produce any practical effect upon that life (the Divine life) which does not awaken a clear sense of moral agency;" and as this cannot be, apart from a knowledge of our minds, "it is as necessary to become acquainted with the various faculties of the mind as to understand the teachings of Divine truth." (Preface, p. 1.) Mr. Bishop having, we presume, studied "the various faculties of the mind," and professing to understand them, seeks to show how they are related to the Divine life which Jesus Christ brings into the world, how they work in that life, and how that life works in them, thus seeking, in this all important sphere, to indicate the connection between the Divine and the human, to point out where the two meet, how they join, and where they separate; which amounts to what we may call the philosophy of the Christian life on the Divine side and on the human.

In many respects a grander design than this cannot be conceived, involving as it does subjects of thought and enquiry worthy of the greatest and best cultivated intellects, and leading to mysteries before which the mightiest must stand in

trembling awe and conscious insufficiency. Accordingly, the strongest, keenest, most far-seeing, and most learned of the Church's sons have been engaged upon it almost from the beginning until now; and yet, according to Mr. Bishop, we are still in darkness and error respecting the great questions at issue. On this point he speaks with all the assurance of an oracle, but not with the modesty his real position demands. "Most of the errors of the present time (he says), in relation to the Christian life, have arisen out of the false philosophy of the past ages; and in many instances we have failed to see the light of Divine truth amidst clouds of human passion and prejudice." (Preface, p. 2.) On reading this with what follows, which is quite in harmony with it, we naturally suppose that he who can account "for most of the errors of the present time" must have more than ordinary gifts of some sort; but when he professes to account for them in this cool, matter-of-course, vague way, we would rather not say anything more definite as to the extraordinary gifts we give him credit for. It would be a great help to all earnest souls to have "most of the errors of the present time" clearly and distinctly stated, much more to see the source of them ably pointed out. What Mr. Bishop says on this latter point must be taken for what it is worth. But whatever he may mean by "the errors of the present time in relation to the Christian life," every thoughtful man must see that the subject of his book touches, more or less, some of the most serious and important questions which are just now engaging the attention both of the Church and the world, as well as subjects which really underlie all these questions.

Mr. Bishop, being impressed with the importance of a settlement of these great and solemn subjects of controversy, has long and anxiously been waiting for some great mind to pour his light upon them, so that they might be cleared of the errors which have resulted from the "false philosophy of the past ages," and of the "clouds of human passion and prejudice" which have so awfully obscured them. But as no one else speaks he speaks, though, as is common in such cases, with professions of inability for the task cruel fate thus imposes upon him. He says, "I am painfully conscious of my inability to do justice to this important subject, and I would not have attempted it had I been acquainted with any work which answers the questions here propounded. I speak simply because I am convinced that some one ought to speak, and because, if others have spoken, I have not heard them." (Preface, p. 11.) We devoutly hope Mr. Bishop is not afflicted

with deafness; for, while we may not be able to point out another book bearing the title of this one, there is hardly an intelligent man living who can read and hear who has not read and heard something on all the points it deals with. If, therefore, Mr. Bishop be not thus afflicted, we cannot tell what to think of him saying "if others have spoken" he has not heard them. But, taking his own words as our guide, the fact that, from some cause, he has not heard what others have said on the subject may account for certain peculiarities of this book, and for the fact that it utterly fails to answer the design of its author, giving not the smallest contribution to a "clearer knowledge of the Divine life," or of any other life. Our conclusion, after a candid and careful reading and study of it, is that it adds another illustration to the fact that design and execution are very different things. This, we think, will become evident to all as we proceed.

In the first chapter, entitled "Preliminary considerations," Mr. Bishop, in a rather obscure way, under the first section, entitled "The nature of power in the human mind," reaches the old-fashioned fact that, within the realm of certain laws, the will of man is free. To illustrate his meaning he draws a distinction, and shows the difference between "the spontaneity of man and that of all other animals"—which is the difference between instinct and reason—the one being "impelled to action without an intelligent plan" (on the part of the creature of course), the other being directed by the conscious "co-operation of all the faculties of the mind to a specific end." Man's peculiar power, therefore, is his self-determining power, the power of his mind, within its own "conditions," to choose or to refuse to exercise the forces by which it shall be governed. Will does not consist merely in the power of spontaneous action—all animals possess that—but in such action being under the dominion of the "higher faculties," which "higher faculties" give what we have just called man's self-determining power, the power of intelligent and active choice.

Having thus dealt with this old, though still disputed, doctrine of mental science, our author goes on to make a general application of his theory to the Christian life. "The perfection of the Divine life (he says) consists in the whole of our native energies being employed for God, in accordance with the laws of Divine truth, and the work of the Holy Spirit renewing it from the elements of that truth." In illustration of this statement, we have a comparison made between the natural life and the spiritual life. "The spiritual birth resembles the natural birth. Every human being comes into the world with a

distinct individuality impressed upon him, but without any actually existing ideas. He is placed at birth in the midst of a system of things perfectly adapted to his nature and organisation. The natural action and reaction which take place between the soul and the outward world, through the medium of the nervous system, furnish him with the primary material of all his ideas in reference to that world. And in the like manner God's holy Word, and the teachings of the Holy Spirit in connection with that Word, constitute the necessary material, through the same laws of the mind, for the perfection of the holy life." Barring a little questionable philosophy, every reader will see at once the perfect obviousness of this quotation, and we only wonder that any man should think fit to put such A. B. C. lessons in a book which is meant to give us new light. In the next two paragraphs we have some fine writing about the sources of knowledge, and the analogy between certain physical forces on the one hand, and certain mental forces on the other, in which such high-sounding words as "Self-consciousness," "Sense-consciousness," and "God-consciousness" occur, leading us to tremble for the impending and awful fate of said consciousnesses. Moreover, these two paragraphs have but a very remote and indistinct connection with what Mr. Bishop has declared to be the subject and purpose of his book; and the same may be said of all he writes till he takes refuge in the statement that "the mode of the connection of the mind with both the natural and the spiritual world is involved in a mystery which we are not likely to unfold in the present state"—a statement which this book itself painfully confirms.

The rest of this first chapter is made up of particular applications and illustrations of the theory thus generally applied. Our inevitable conclusion, after examining both what is general and what is particular in these "preliminary considerations," is that if, up to the point to which they bring us, our author be at variance with any one, it must be either with sceptical necessitarians or with Calvinists, religious necessitarians, or with both. But with the former he cannot deal in a book like this, for they do not believe in what is here called "The Divine Life." They must be met on ground common alike to them and their opponents. On the ground which he now occupies, Mr. Bishop can only deal with Calvinists, the term Calvinist, as we now use it, being taken to mean all religious or Christian necessitarians; and with these, it seems to us, (like most of the same school who have gone before him) he is substantially and practically agreed; especially does this appear

when we carefully consider the passages which explain and modify his broadest Arminian statements. Had we space at command, we could easily show that, on the one hand, it would be next to impossible to point out any real or practical difference between the doctrine of the will taught and expounded by Mr. Bishop, in relation to "The Divine Life," and that taught in the fourth of "the five points" of Calvinism, which is "On grace and free-will," and, that on the other hand, no intelligent man could fail to see that the two doctrines are really and practically one and the same. If there really be any difference between them, it is one of mere words, and therefore lies in the statement of them, and not in the doctrines themselves; it is, therefore, so small that no sensible Calvinist of this day would deem it worth his while to dispute either with Mr. Bishop or any other man about it. Indeed, we may say, in passing, that it seems to be high time that wise and thoughtful men, on both sides, should come, as we believe they are coming, to the conclusion that all the differences between Calvinism and Arminianism are chiefly of this character, or that they arise from viewing the same doctrines in different aspects, or from different stand-points, and that the first cause of all the conflicts between the two systems is found in the fact that they meet on grounds too purely abstract and metaphysical to be logically described and defined with verbal exactness. For ourselves, we take it to be indisputable that this conclusion alone explains the well-known fact that all who go thoroughly into the subject are both Calvinists and Arminians by turns, and sometimes neither one nor the other, in what we may honourably call the esoteric circle of their conceptions and beliefs. We further submit that this conclusion alone also explains the still better known fact that the differences in question have little or no effect upon the practice of their respective intelligent and earnest adherents; and as to those who are not intelligent and earnest, we must educate them, and then leave them. The battles between the two systems having to be fought on the border land of infinite darkness and mystery, where nothing can be distinctly seen or firmly grasped, when the combatants come to matters of palpable and pressing fact, when they thus emerge into daylight, they feel themselves compelled (the freedom of the will notwithstanding) to treat the struggles of the darkness as but a comparatively small phase of their being. Hence neither Calvinism nor Arminianism can rule wise and thoughtful men by its peculiarities; each, in the nature of things, if it rule at all, is bound to rule by those great, broad, comprehensive, and practical principles which are common to both. Therefore it

is, we believe, with God's blessing, that men on both sides have been so largely and—may we not say?—equally successful.

The exposition and application of the principles thus reviewed occupy thirty-three pages of this book; from the 33rd page to the 374th, the last in the book, the writer still further developes these principles in connection with the following, which he speaks of as "doctrines in connection with the Divine life:"—Repentance, Faith, Conversion, Sanctification, Perfection, Preaching, Prayer and Providence.

What has been said of the previous part of the book may be generally said of this also, that it teaches nothing at all new, amounting, as it does, simply to a sermon on each of the above doctrines so-called. Whether what is here written has been used for sermons or not we do not pretend to say, as it does not concern us to enquire; but, most decidedly, these chapters have a great likeness to a certain style of sermonising, in that they contain needless scraps of Greek on repentance, faith, conversion—"expositions of the original," as learned and other men call them. Such items, in presence of the great questions which ought to have been discussed in this book are not pleasant to look at or think of. The principal difference between these particular expositions of Christian doctrine and the general run of sermons is that they are semi-philosophical, and, consequently, misty at times.

But, while all we have thus written of this book, as a whole, is true, in all fairness, we are glad to admit that here and there, it furnishes us with thoughts and sentiments which, either for one good reason or another, are worthy of special consideration. We had marked and classified a considerable number of these for quotation and comment, but for want of space we are obliged to forego them.

After the admission contained in the preceding paragraph, we feel it to be a thankless task indeed to have to direct attention to a part of the book which demands notice, not for a good reason, but rather for a bad one, in so far as Mr. Bishop's knowledge and judgment are concerned. We would pass it over if we could, but as, in addition to its being so bad in itself, it is not the only one of its class, we must notice it. We shall explain and justify ourselves, informally, as we advance.

We proceed then to deal as briefly as possible with the chapter on "Human power in relation to Providence," which is the last in the book. The principal subject dealt with in this chapter, and the only one we can now notice, is the "Introduction into our world of moral evil." Mr. Bishop

begins his remarks upon this,—"one of the greatest problems in the universe,"—by saying—"It seems presumptuous to attempt to explain this mystery, after the unsuccessful attempts of some of the greatest minds of the past. We do not approach this subject with any conceit of superior mental power, but in the belief that truth is no respector of persons, and that, like its Author, it will reveal itself to those who love it, whether great or small." (Page 343.) The insinuation implied in these words against "some of the greatest minds of the past," and also against those who are still in doubt and darkness on this awful subject—that they do not sufficiently love the truth—is quite in harmony with what follows. On the next page, we read that "such men as Augustine, Hobbes, Leibnitz, and Edwards, were beclouded by a false philosophy, and bewildered by a still more false theology. Each supported some particular theory, so false as to neutralise every effort to arrive at the truth, and, when it was impossible to harmonise the false philosophy with their false theology, they naturally thought that both were involved in impenetrable mystery, which it were almost impiety to attempt to understand. . . . . They built castles in the air, and then wondered they had no rock for their foundation." After Mr. Bishop has thus summarily disposed of some of the most gifted intellects that have ever tried to fathom this profound subject, not only telling us that they were all in darkness but also why they were thus benighted, we naturally expect that he, one of the lovers of truth, living "in the present day," who are "in a position to understand the mystery of evil better than the great men who have written upon it in the past," will give us at least a little new light. But, in what he proceeds to say, there is not anything at all to help those "who"—to quote from his preface—"instead of walking in the light as God is in the light have been lost in the darkness of human error." On the other hand, in the very next words which succeed those we have just formally quoted, there is what appears to us a very defective statement even as to the real questions at issue. We are told that "the attempts of the past have generally been to reconcile the introduction of moral evil, not with the freedom of the will, but with the doctrine of necessity, which is an impossibility. Augustine, Luther, Calvin, all denied the freedom of the will." Now we greatly wonder that Mr. Bishop should make such a broad, unqualified statement as that contained in this latter sentence, and we appeal for justification of the wonder to every man who really knows the writings of

these men; and, in so far as Calvin is concerned, we have already said that the doctrine of the will taught by him is substantially the same as that taught by Mr. Bishop. Our author here, therefore, is loose and extravagant. But without saying more of the second of these two sentences, the first is but very partially true of the past, and hardly true at all in respect of the present. We submit that, in the past, the great problem has been not to reconcile the existence of moral evil either directly with the doctrine of necessity on the one side, or with the freedom of the will on the other, but with the known character of Almighty God, regarded in the light of the received belief respecting the nature and design of moral evil and its ultimate place in the universe. We did not therefore need to be told that, in the freedom of the will, "it is not difficult to see the principle by which we can account for the introduction of moral evil in accordance with providential government." (p. 349.) As an independent proposition we can easily see how that man, being free, could take either of the two opposite courses—the one called right and the other wrong—and how, in this way, the existence of moral evil is accounted for; but the perplexity is in the belief that this evil is, to a great extent, absolute and eternal, and in the seeming antagonism between this belief and the character of the Almighty Creator and Ruler. It is difficult to conceive that, either by the contingencies and issues of human freedom or by anything else, He should, in any sense or to any extent, be defeated in regard to His ultimate purposes, the essential harmony between those purposes and His known character being taken for granted; and yet the fearful thought is suggested to many minds that He will be thus defeated on the supposition that moral evil is to exist for ever. True it is that He has provided against the evil in redemption by Jesus Christ, and where redemption succeeds the mystery is, to a considerable extent, cleared away; but where redemption fails is not the mystery as great as ever? Of course, Mr. Bishop throws the blame of the failure of Redemption, as of all the evil issues of his freedom, upon man himself; but that is only to shift the difficulty, not to take it entirely away. For thus dealt with the difficulty comes back in a form something like this:—Granted, as we cannot help granting, that all the blame of the coming in of moral evil and of the failure of Redemption rests with man, how can we reconcile this with the fact that God should make a being, the issues of whose freedom should end in eternal mischief and dishonour both to the creature thus constituted and to Himself? How can this

fact be reconciled with the infinite knowledge, wisdom, power, and goodness of Him who is the Creator, Ruler, and Father of the creature whom He thus permits to ruin himself everlastingly? It is strange that Mr. Bishop should not have seen that this question lies at the very foundation and goes to the heart of the mysteries which perplex and oppress men's minds in relation to the subject he here brings before us, and that the purely metaphysical matters of controversy to which he gives the most prominent place are really but incidental, accidental, or circumstantial to it.

We close this book with the manifold reflection how much, and yet how little, we know of the deepest things of life, whether in nature or religion, and how while God gloriously reveals Himself, He is yet in an awful sense hidden, and how, next to Him, we ourselves are the greatest mystery we ever meet with. To the relation subsisting between God and ourselves there pertain many plain and blessed truths, but it also involves intricate and perplexing mysteries. Still, no matter how it baffles us, we can see that this is quite inevitable. The great lesson, therefore, which we should learn from it is to be modest, humble, patient, reverent. We may speculate, perhaps we must do so; but the angel who guards "the secret things" which belong unto the Most High says—"So far thou art safe—further at thy awful peril." Thrice blessed is he then who knows where and when to check the upward or downward movements of his intellect, and who, before profoundest darkness and trembling weakness, which come of strength and daring, can calm the tumults of his spirit. To such knowledge and to such power, all men, as God's creatures and God's children, are called. Before the inexplicable things that surround him, that are within him, and above him, it thus lies upon every man, as a burden of obligation, in obedience to the warning voice, to wait as he best may or can, with what patience and hope he can secure, or with such fear and pain as come to him, whether he will or not, but without any rebellion at all against God, all the length of God's own time. Thus to wait is our divinely appointed doom, our unavoidable task. To help us wisely and obediently to submit to the doom, and successfully to learn the task, it were well for us to get all we can out of the fact that all matters of daily and ordinary duty are made plain, and that to do present duty is to clear the way and prepare for the duty or the condition of the future. Duty fulfilled invariably leads to light and calmness. In the meantime let it be our consolation and joy to believe that Chris-

tianity will survive our little disputes about this, that, and the other. Christianity is very much more than any of the controversial questions this book discusses or suggests, and which have such power to agitate men's minds. It is life, not theology, nor philosophy; these are but the forms which men give to it, or get out of it, the mediums through which they view it; and so, while these wax old and have to be laid aside, it endureth to be man's greatest blessing and surest guide.

W. MELLOR.

ART. III.—THE METHODIST NEW CONNEXION MAGAZINE FOR JANUARY, 1872.

In the January number of the *Methodist New Connexion Magazine* there is a notice of the METHODIST QUARTERLY from the pen of the editor, the Rev. J. H. Robinson. Of the character of that notice we have just reason to complain, and we shall not be faithful to the interests of truth and charity if we pass it over without reply. It is with great regret that we have thus to introduce into our pages anything approaching to personal controversy. But we are left without choice in the matter; we must speak in self-vindication, or our silence will be construed by many—and very naturally so—into a virtual admission of the correctness of the strictures which the editor of that periodical has seen fit to pass upon us.

That Mr. Robinson should give a notice otherwise than favourable to the METHODIST QUARTERLY is in itself no offence to its conductors. By his own showing they could, had they been so disposed, have prevented the appearance of such a notice, though, by the way, we must say we cannot reconcile his conduct as described in a note to the critique, and his statement in the text. It puzzles us how he could at once offer not to review the METHODIST QUARTERLY because he would have to oppose the views of its writers, and yet feel "that, however disagreeable the duty was, it was a duty nevertheless to challenge those objectionable statements, whether we please or displease; whether we make enemies or friends by so doing."

We are, also, unable to understand the diverse judgments which Mr. Robinson has delivered. In the magazine for August, 1871, he said (page 512)—"This (the METHODIST QUARTERLY for June, 1871), is a good number, above the average in merit. Its articles are vigorous, fresh, and readable. They comprise—'Resurrection of the Dead,' we presume by the editor, concerning which there may be some difference of opinion as to the positions taken; but it is well written, and gives us the most recent results of theological thought in England on the subject." Then after enumerating the other articles, he concludes thus, "the whole are creditable to the writers." But in the issue of the magazine before us (January, 1872) he pursues another line of criticism. To this same article on the Resurrection, Mr. Robinson now applies the following phrases, viz., "confusion of thought," "hesitancy of language," "much useless hair-splitting," "shocking statement," "such words are wanting of good taste as they are of Scripture warrant," "they are an insult to our humanity and a desecration of our most sacred affections," "this metaphysical jangle," "its resurrection is a resurrection of nothing; it is a wearisome, cold, icy dilution of the doctrine, and ends in an idea—not a fact," "the weary mass of metaphysical verbiage through which we have been compelled to wade, especially in the article on the Resurrection." Our readers will not be able, we think, to see the consistency of these two critical and editorial deliverances; and, as they cannot both be correct, we should like to know by which one Mr. Robinson intends to abide, which he rejects, and which he retains as agreeing best with his "honest convictions." He must repudiate one of them, for the article to which the epithets just quoted would strictly apply cannot be, as he asserted in August it was, "well written," nor fit to be included in that list of articles which he said were "vigorous, fresh, and readable." But if he holds to the opinion expressed at that time, then the adverse criticism in the January magazine must be pronounced to be wild, exaggerated, nay simply unfounded. Mr. Robinson must himself elect on which horn of the dilemma he will be impaled; and if he succeeds in choosing one by which neither his independence, nor his intelligence, nor his candour is damaged, our readers will, doubtless, like ourselves, be gratified. We cannot, however, help him in the selection, though we are anxious to know which of the horns he prefers. If he does not decline the alternative altogether, but boldly decides, it will be very edifying to ascertain whether he adopts, as final, the judgment which was so tender and considerate when the author of the

article in question was presumed to be the "editor," or that which was so unsparing when the writer was discovered to be "a young man."

But we shall not, apart from these inconsistencies, complain of the adverse character of the criticism. Mr. Robinson is welcome to his "honest convictions" as far as we are concerned, and also to the proper expression of them in the magazine he conducts, though it be the official organ of the body to which we belong. What we complain of is the incorrectness, and, we must add, the practical if not intentional unfairness of the notice; for in no other light can we regard the insinuations it contains respecting our integrity and honesty of purpose.

In reply to these allegations we may probably be referred to the avowal with which the critique is prefaced, that the strictures are made "without any hostility to the publication, or any other than kindly feeling towards its conductors and writers." Without any reserve we say we believe those words were written with all sincerity, but we also believe they were written under the influence of a little self-delusion. If there was no hostility to the METHODIST QUARTERLY felt, then it is a case of an attempt to kill without *malice prepense*, for assuredly it is not the writer's fault if we survive the attack he makes upon us; and if there were no other than kindly feelings cherished towards the conductors and writers, then are we furnished with a singular illustration of how extremes meet, for we do not see how the most decided unkindness could have more consistently manifested itself.

What are the charges brought against us? That our aim is to startle with wild statements on subjects held dear and sacred—to shock by speculations which, if they can be understood at all—but that is deemed doubtful even in the case of the writers themselves—can have no other result than to open up afresh to dispute and question some of the most sacred and settled beliefs "most surely accepted among us." Again, the periodical is spoken of as "having become the platform for intellectual gladiatorship, and a medium by which some of its writers can show off their dialectics, and confuse by their fine-spun logomachies." These, it must be admitted, are rather grave accusations, and in them we can detect the voice neither of friendship nor friendliness, except in a sense we utterly repudiate. We hope to show to all candid minds that we are not the transgressors against truth and righteousness represented, and, therefore, that Mr. Robinson's friendly flagellations should be laid on his own shoulders for his want of that charity which "thinketh no evil."

The following articles are specified in justification of these aspersions: "The Resurrection of the Dead" (June, 1871), "Eternal Punishment," and "Church Problems" (Dec., 1871); the two first named being the product of the same pen.

But before adducing direct proof of the justness of his censures, the writer admits that his grievance is to some extent a "sentimental" one, arising from the circumstance that in these articles orthodoxy, or at least what is considered orthodoxy, is not spoken of with sufficient respect. To make good this complaint he quotes two sentences:—"So far as theology is concerned, this a transitional age;" "So all Church problems are not solved, *they are but being solved.* Our generation can gain no greater glory on earth than in passing on to its successor a TRUER faith, and a purer Church life than it received. Any honest endeavour to leave such a heritage is *praiseworthy.*" The italics and capitals are our censor's.

Will our friendly critic allow a little pleasantry in the discussion of these serious matters? Some years ago we heard him give in Conference a homily to his younger brethren on the necessity of using easy and understandable words in preaching. He had not proceeded very far before there fell from his lips this sentence, "But every man has his idiosyncracy." In a parenthesis we may say, that this sentence, being in such beautiful harmony with the counsel he was giving, provoked roars of laughter, which the speaker seemed to relish as much as anyone. We believe the sentence contains a truth; every man, even the Editor of the *Methodist New Connexion Magazine*, has his idiosyncracy, and the remembrance of this explains to us, in a great measure, his notice of the METHODIST QUARTERLY, and so modifies our dissatisfaction with its character and tone.

For the present we say nothing of the comments made on the quoted sentences, nor of the way they are twisted to make them justify the "sentimental grievance" under which the writer professes to suffer. We would ask *him* also to forget what he has written about these sentences, and try, with unprejudiced mind, to look at them again, and see whether really in themselves, or by their connection, they portend the evil he has affirmed they do. We are confident it will be owing to his "idiosyncracy" if we do not succeed in leading him to reverse his judgment.

The first sentence occurs near the beginning of the article on "The Resurrection of the Dead." The writer asserts that the existence of the books placed at the head of his article is an evidence of the revived interest in the doctrine of the

Resurrection which characterizes theological thought in the present day. The unbelief of the times has undoubtedly spurred into greater activity the thought of the religious public, but the steady and persistent advocacy of Christianity by learned and good men has contributed to the same result. Then comes the sentence which has helped to create the sentimental grievance complained of. "So far as theology is concerned, this is a transitional age."

There is an acknowledged canon of criticism which runs,—

> "In every work regard the author's end,
> Since none can compass more than they intend."

In the construction put on any portion or passage of a work, this rule should undoubtedly be observed if we mean our criticism to be true and equitable. In what sense, then, according to the writer's view, is this a transitional age as regards theology? His following sentences tell us unmistakably "Reason is in apparent conflict with faith. To disabuse the mind of this imagined antagonism just and searching investigation into the evidence generally, but especially the historic evidence of Christianity, is necessary. Reason must be satisfied that faith is reasonable. We gladly go back with our opponents to the age of our Lord, confident that we shall return from a re-examination of the principal events convinced that the historic foundations of Christianity are immovable."—M. Q. page 92.

Is there any mystification about sentences such as these? Are they "as clear as mud," to use the elegant phraseology of the critique? Anything more pellucid we cannot conceive. And *are they true*? For using such words as these ought a writer to have his name associated by the editor of a religious magazine with that of Colenso, and be suspected of adopting the cant of the whole tribe of the assailants of orthodoxy in our day?" What in our judgment adds to the wrongness of the conduct in this matter is that the assailed and assailant are ministers in the same body, and the periodical in which the assault is made is no private publication, but the organ of the denomination to which all the parties concerned belong. We must be forgiven, then, for the manifestation of a little warmth, for we feel that the editor has done a worthy and gifted brother a grievous wrong. We venture to say for the writer of the article, and for the conductors of the *Quarterly* as well, that they have as little sympathy with Colenso as the editor of the *Meth. New Connexion Magazine* has, and are, both by pen and tongue, as abstinent of the use of cant, whether it be the cant of the orthodox or of the heterodox, as he.

We have spoken of the way in which the offending sentences have been twisted and turned. These words are not intended by us to be offensive. We use them without reference to the writer's motives or design. By a strange process of manipulation the "age" is narrowed to mean the Methodists, or more strictly, the Methodists of the New Connexion, and thus the meaning of the statement construed into,—"The theology of Methodists, or the theology of the Methodist New Connexion, is in a state of transition," which we are told is not correct. "We know enough of the members of the Methodist New Connexion, and of the families among whom the QUARTERLY circulates, to warrant us in saying that with them the age is *not* transitional as to its theology."

Were ever man's words more misapprehended, or diverted from their intended and true meaning than these, by the singular treatment to which they are thus subjected! And we must be forgiven for adding how pitiable is the attempt to make the METHODIST QUARTERLY an object of suspicion and distrust to those to whose patronage the reviewer tells us a few sentences before we are indebted for its existence!

Mr. Robinson falls into a misconception quite as serious and unaccountable when he interprets another sentence (M.Q. p. 295) as referring exclusively or principally to the New Connexion; "Many of the popular views of Christianity are obtained from the thousands of sermons preached in *our* pulpits every Sabbath-day, *most of which*, as being delivered extemporaneously, and as characterised by more or less of unthoroughness of treatment are *unreliable* as authoritative statements of doctrine." Are there no other pulpits than those of the New Connexion? The author is speaking generally, and it is peculiar criticism that construes his words into an indictment against the denomination to which he belongs. But, read with the wide application intelligence and candour ought to recognise, we suppose they contain a statement quite unexceptionable; for surely Mr. Robinson is not prepared to accept as trustworthy the conflicting opinions which are uttered every Sunday from some 30,000 pulpits.

But we have to consider the second sentence on which our reviewer rests his sentimental grievance. "And so all Church problems are not solved, they are but being solved. Our generation can gain no greater glory on earth than in passing on to its success or a truer faith and a purer Church life than it received. Any honest endeavour to leave such a heritage is praiseworthy."

Little, we dare vouch, did the writer, when he penned these

sentences, dream that he was penning words for which he would be ruthlessly gibbeted, as a patron or promoter of heresy, in the pages of his own denominational magazine, and as little for such words does he deserve such a fate, be it attended either with honour or with ignominy. "To say that Church problems (*all* of them mind) are not solved, but are being solved, and that we can have no greater glory on earth than in passing on to our successors a *truer* faith than we have received, and that *any* honest endeavour to leave such a heritage is *praiseworthy*, only shows, to use the mildest words, how carelessly and recklessly it is possible for men sometimes to write." Another such specimen of hyper-criticism we should think the English language does not supply. The word "all" is italicized in evident misapprehension of the writer's meaning. Any candid reader will see this, and render the statement,—"and so Church problems are not all solved;" and not as is done by our orthodox assailant,—"no Church problems are solved." We may apply the same remark to the second italicized word. The endeavour which is commended is not qualified by *any* but by *honest*—"any honest endeavour," or any endeavour that is honest. The reason for italicizing *praiseworthy* we cannot conjecture, at least we hope the one suggested to us is not correct. But why *truer* is, the following sentence perhaps indicates—"We were not aware that truth had a comparative and superlative degree. That which is true cannot be truer, and if we have the truth we have nothing to pass on to another generation which is truer." The mood of mind in which such reasoning could pass for argument is but too evident. If we must descend to like quibbling, we would remind him who uses it that the writer did not say a truer truth, but a truer faith, and the carping criticism of the phrase leaves the impression that the writer was bent on finding fault whether or not. Of it, far more than of the passage criticised, may his own language be employed,—it "only shows, to use the mildest words, how carelessly and recklessly it is possible for men sometimes to write."

But let us go from the expression to the thought it embodies, and see whether that deserves the reprobation it has received. The QUARTERLY writer had been reviewing—rather sketchily—"Ecclesia: Church Problems considered in a Series of Essays." The book is the product of various writers belonging to the Congregational body, edited by Dr. Reynolds, President of Cheshunt College. The subjects embraced in it are,—The Rule of Faith; The Incarnation; Baptismal Regen-

eration; Art and Religion; The Catholic Church; The Idea of the Church in relation to Modern Congregationalism; and Our National Universities. We are thus full in our enumeration that the reader may see without the trouble of reference what Church problems are specially intended. The respective writers are Drs. Reynolds, Alexander, of Edinburgh, and Mellor, of Halifax; with the Revds. R. W. Dale, H. Batchelor, and Messrs. J. Gilbert and A. S. Wilkins. After indicating the salient points of each essay, with such accompanying remarks as he thought proper to give, the book is put aside with the reflection, "And so all Church problems are not solved, they are but being solved. Our generation can gain no greater glory on earth than in passing on to its successor a truer faith and a purer Church life than it received. Any endeavour to leave such a heritage is praiseworthy."

In the name of Christian charity, of common sense, of rational intelligence, and of grammatical construction, what of heresy, of latitudinarianism, is there in all this? What to lift up the hands and eyes in pious horror about? What to sound the alarum, or hoist the danger signal? What that should constitute a "sentimental" grievance to any one, except it might be to a bigoted Romanist, who believes in the Pope's supremacy and infallibility? Does not the first sentence simply state a fact? Church problems are *not* all solved. Was it not in recognition of this fact that *Ecclesia* was written and published? And was it not the desire to help their generation to a truer faith and a purer Church life, that prompted the writers to undertake their work? And who cries them down as heretics for having done it? Who does not deem them worthy of all praise for having attempted their task, even though they may have left some problems unsolved? A worthier, nobler sentiment was never uttered than the decried sentence contains. We endorse it with all the intelligence with which we are endowed, and embrace it with all the ardour of which our nature is capable. It ought to be the grand rule, the constant watchword, of every Christian's life, and the life of every Christian Church, and of every Christian denomination. The limitation, or direct application, of these sentences to Methodism, and still more to the Methodist New Connexion, and then the construing of them as if they intended that the faith of this body was not *true*, or its Church life not *pure*, is something to make one marvel. We hesitate not to say that neither his own denomination, nor any Methodist denomination, was in the writer's mind with any speciality when he wrote the paragraph; and

if we, as Editor of the METHODIST QUARTERLY, must give a confession of faith on the question, we can avow that it is our firmly held conviction that in Methodism there is as true a faith and as pure a Church life as are to be found in any denomination in Christendom.

But how it can be called careless and reckless writing to speak about a truer faith, and a purer life, than any Church has yet attained to, surpasses our understanding. Who will say that all faiths,—that is, all so-called Christian faiths, the Creeds of Christendom,—are equally and absolutely true? Is there no difference between Popery and Protestantism; between Unitarianism and Trinitarianism; between Predestinarianism and Arminianism; between Sacerdotalism and Evangelicism? What has been the object for which great reformers have lived, and laboured, and suffered—at least those whom we delight to honour—but to bring men to a truer faith? And yet because a writer in the METHODIST QUARTERLY says, "Our generation can gain no greater glory on earth than in passing on to its successor a truer faith," a brother minister thinks he is in duty bound to put him and the periodical in his editorial pillory, and pelt him and it with all the offensive and harmful missiles at his command.

But let us be more specific. The "truer faith" spoken of ought certainly to be construed as relating to the questions discussed, or adverted to, in the article in which it occurs. Now what are they? First, there is the Rule of Faith. Are the Papists, the Anglicans, or the Protestants right on this subject? Has the Pope or the Priesthood authority to give this rule, or is it supplied to us in the Bible? Is the Sacred Word to be read by the people with the right to exercise individual judgment on its teachings; or are Councils and the Clergy to withhold it at their pleasure, and decide what interpretation is to be put upon it? What, too, is the faith that should condition Church membership? Faith in a formulated creed, or what? Then there are the Incarnation, the Doctrine of the Real Presence in the Sacrament, Baptismal Regeneration, the Catholic Church, and the Idea of the Church in relation to Modern Congregationalism; and finally the Relation of Art to Religion. On these it is, and the questions which are essentially interwoven with them, that the writer speaks of a truer faith being obtained; and the state of all Christian Churches or denominations in our land justifies his language; so justifies it that our wonder is how any one can for a moment demur to the sentiment that any honest endeavour to impart such a faith is praiseworthy.

So much for the "reprehensible language" on which the reviewer founds his "sentimental" grievance. But we are told it is questionable whether this language is not surpassed in its equivocal and dangerous tone by what is used on pages 202 and 203. The reference is to a passage which occurs in the notice of Dr. W. L. Alexander's essay on the Incarnation, and is but a response to the beautiful Christian spirit which pervades that essay. And what does the sentiment so severely censured amount to? "Had Christians," remarks Dr. Alexander, "rested content with accepting the *fact* of the Incarnation on the ground of scripture testimony, the Church might have been spared much perplexing discussion and much bitter, nay furious conflict. It may be doubted, however, whether it be possible for the human mind to accept such a fact without speculating upon it, and endeavouring to arrive at some theory of it, at least at some way of describing it such as shall enable a thoughtful man to construe it to himself." He afterwards adds, "That this necessity was felt by the early Christians is evident from the opinions advanced by Eutyches, Apollinarius, and others respecting the two natures in Christ. These were denounced by the dominant party in the Church as heretical, but in reality they were attempts made by sincere believers to represent to others in an intelligible way the facts concerning the Saviour which they had received. All of them held the proper deity and the proper humanity of Jesus Christ; they erred only, where they erred at all, in the theory they adopted as to the manner in which these two natures were united in Him."

The writer in the METHODIST QUARTERLY does not endorse the views of Eutyches; he simply tells us that the difficulties and troubles, that is the *intellectual* difficulties and troubles of such thinkers as he, have perpetuated themselves to this day, and rise up in many a mind which has never known of such efforts as those made by Eutyches. He then by various considerations shows that these thinkers should be treated with much charity and liberty, adding, "we dare not call any man a liar (in allusion to 1 John ii., 22) who does not deny the *fact* (of the Incarnation), whatever be his particular representation of it to himself." But before he makes that statement he inserts in a parenthesis a sentence, or rather half a sentence, from Dr. Alexander's essay, which in Mr. Robinson's quotation is left out,—"It may be at once admitted that the *explanation* of the fact lies beyond our reach;" the other portion of the sentence is also worthy of citation,—"With our limited capacity and knowledge we can never say *how* it is that the divine and human natures are united in Christ Jesus."

We will not repeat Mr. Robinson's splenetic comments upon these "charitable" and "advanced liberal views" as he derisively calls them. With all proper respect, and yet very sincerely, we say they are unworthy the intelligence of a theologian and the heart of a Christian minister. A more perverse and perverting piece of criticism is not within our knowledge, for after, by some trick of legerdemain, carrying us from Eutyches down to the writers of the "Essays and Reviews," and having enumerated a list of names to which popular theological odium attaches, he adds, "all of whom have admitted the *fact*, but all of whom have falsely and unscripturally, in their own 'particular and independent' way of representing the fact to themselves,

> 'Kept the word of promise to the ear,
> And broke it to the sense,'

we have a mass of theories on the Incarnation, against which the early Councils raised their distinct protest, against which evangelical teaching has been equally distinct, and which no Methodist teacher we have ever been acquainted with has treated with the laxity and 'charity' of this writer in the METHODIST QUARTERLY. But, then, these are days of illumination; and who can tell what he may see and hear before he dies?"

Certainly such criticism as this is devoid of "charity," and, we are obliged to add, of exactness and fairness too. The writer of it knows, or he ought to have known, otherwise he was not qualified for the performance of his self-imposed task, that he was putting more into his indictment against our contributor than the facts of the case warranted. Let him read the following from the pen of John Wesley:—"Again: 'The word was made flesh.' I believe this *fact* also. There is no mystery in it; but as to the *manner how* He was made flesh, wherein the mystery lies, I know nothing about it, I believe nothing about it; it is no more the object of my faith than it is of my understanding." Dr. Guthrie, editor of the *Sunday Magazine*, in noticing Ward Beecher's "Life of Jesus the Christ," says—"His theory of the person of Christ is too like the old Monophysite heresy." "Yet"—our readers may judge what would have followed from the pen of our reviewer—"Yet we honour him for this book." It is a little comfort to the writers in the METHODIST QUARTERLY to commit the sin of charity in such good company as that of John Wesley and Dr. Guthrie.

Of the critique, if critique it may be called, on the "Resurrection," we have little to say. When the article was offered for

our acceptance we did not read it to ascertain whether in every iota it reflected our opinion, but to see whether the writer handled the interesting question he dealt with in a way to relieve it in any degree of the philosophical difficulties with which it is beset. Our impression was that he did, and that impression is deepened by repeated and careful perusal. We think highly of the ability displayed in the discussion of the topic, and if in some parts there are obscure points, things hard to be understood, we should think that might reasonably be expected. On the principle, which our reviewer seems to have adopted, that all thoughts to be accepted should be clear to our apprehension without painful or even careful meditation, certainly the article will not be read beyond its first part; we are, however, thankful to know that such a principle is not adopted by all readers—we hope not at all by the readers of the QUARTERLY. We should be sorry to cater for the tastes and appetites of those who were too indolent to masticate the meat supplied to them. Perhaps it is the writer's fault that one sentence in the article is so obscure that the reviewer cannot imagine its meaning, and perhaps it was editorial carelessness that let the sentence pass in its original obscurity. Still we cannot but think a little attention to the drift of the writer's statements will have enabled most readers to perceive his meaning—"All that revelation affirms, when carefully examined, is simply the fact that we as persons shall rise from the dead, or at a certain time shall cease to exist in a state of death, or shall cease to remain in a state of death."

The philosophical questions as to what constitutes personal identity, and personality, we leave as discussed in the article. Some may have no taste nor faculty for such discussions, and on such it would be worse than useless to force them. We are content to leave to those who have a liking for metaphysical speculations, and powers and habits of mind profitably to engage in them, to decide between our contributor and his disparaging reviewer.

But as the views advanced affect biblical interpretation we transfer to our pages the note on 1 Cor. xv., 50, in Conybeare and Howson's Life of St. Paul, vol. ii., p. 74:—

"The importance of the subject justifies our quoting, at some length, the admirable remarks of Dr. Burton (formerly Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford), on this passage, in the hope that his high reputation for learning and for unblemished orthodoxy may lead some persons to reconsider the loose and unscriptural language they are in the habit of using;—After regretting that some of the

early fathers have (when treating of *The Resurrection of the Body*) appeared to contradict these words of St. Paul, Dr. Burton continues as follows :—

'It is nowhere asserted in the New Testament that we shall rise again *with our bodies.* Unless a man will say that the stalk, the blade, and the ear of corn are actually the same thing with the single grain which is put into the ground, he cannot quote St. Paul as saying that we shall rise again with the same bodies; or at least he must allow that the future body may only be like to the present one, inasmuch as both come under the same genus; *i.e.*, we speak of human *bodies*, and we speak of heavenly *bodies.* But St. Paul's words do not warrant us in saying that the resemblance between the present and future body will be greater than between a man and a star, or between a bird and a fish. Nothing can be plainer than the expression which he uses in the first of these two analogies. *Thou sowest not that body that shall be.* He says, also, with equal plainness, of the body, *It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body; there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body.* These words require to be examined closely, and involve remotely a deep metaphysical question. In common language the terms *body* and *spirit* are accustomed to be opposed, and are used to represent two things which are totally distinct. But St. Paul here brings the two expressions together, and speaks of a *spiritual body.* St. Paul, therefore, did not oppose *body to spirit*, and though the looseness of modern language may allow us to do so, and yet be correct in our ideas, it may save some confusion if we consider *spirit* as opposed to *matter*, and if we take *body* to be a generic term, which comprises both. *A body*, therefore, in the language of St. Paul, is something which has a distinct individual existence.' . . . . . .

'St. Paul tells us that every individual, when he rises again, will have a spiritual body; but the remarks which I have made may show how different is the idea conveyed by these words from the notion which some persons entertain, that we shall rise again with the *same identical body.* St. Paul appears effectually to preclude this notion, when he says, *Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.*' —Burton's Lectures, pp. 429—431."

The notice of the article on Eternal Punishment furnishes more instances of the substitution of banter and abuse for equitable criticism, but we let it pass. The animus is too evident, the misconstructions are too apparent, and the censures too unmerited, to do any one harm save the writer himself. One perhaps ought to be thankful to be told that, on the whole, no exception is taken to the doctrinal views of that article.

As to Mr. Robinson's other statements, we are content to leave our readers to form their own judgment; but if it should lead them to denounce his flippancy and uncriticalness we can only say it will not materially differ from our own. If the

possession of such qualities in the Editor of a periodical be requisite and helpful to its success, then there can be little doubt that the *Methodist New Connexion Magazine* will have a prosperous future; but, in that case, it is equally certain that the METHODIST QUARTERLY will pale its ineffectual fire.

JOHN HUDSTON.

ART. IV.—THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

1. *Science and the Gospel; or, the Church and the Nations.* A series of Essays on Great Catholic Questions. London: Macmillan and Co., and Anglican and International Christian Moral Science Association, 1870.
2. *The Catholic Christian Moralist and Systematic Benefactor*, November, 1871. London office: 8, Old Jewry.

PROBABLY there is no question connected with the interests of the Christian Church which has of late years assumed greater importance, and given rise to more discussion, than the possibility of closer unity of faith and action amongst Christians. There seems to be a general conviction that there should be some common ground which might be effectively occupied, and from which more successful resistance might be made against attacks upon our common faith.

Indeed it is perhaps in consequence of the increase and persistency of such attacks that the need of greater unity has become evident. In the face of the formidable dangers which appear to threaten the security of the foundations of Christianity, it is felt that all who hold the "truth in Jesus" must, in spite of many and wide differences amongst themselves, combine their efforts for the defence and propagation of the faith common to all. Christians have thus been led to reflect upon the much forgotten duty of "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," and to perceive that bigotry, strife, and narrow exclusiveness are hostile to the spirit and precepts of the religion of Jesus Christ.

This is one of the favourable indications afforded by the present time, and, indeed, in a certain degree it is peculiar to

our own day. Perhaps never before were there so many intelligent and pious men longing and working for the subsidence of strifes and dissensions amongst the churches, and for the attainment of true unity. For while there are many and varying conceptions as to the nature of that unity, and while the methods by which it is sought are in many cases widely divergent, yet we believe the object is mainly the same, and is surely in accordance with the spirit of our Saviour's prayer—"That they all may be one."

The volume and serial named at the head of this article have been called forth by this tendency of our time. They are the symbols of an Association formed with the avowed object of providing a basis upon which Christians of all evangelical denominations may meet for defensive and aggressive purposes. "Science and the Gospel" contains four essays, or rather treatises, furnished respectively by members of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational churches; and to each writer a prize of fifty guineas has been awarded. The writing is of a very high order, though possibly too abstract for popularity; but there is an evident freedom from ecclesiastical prejudices, a breadth of view, and a large-hearted charity which cannot fail to commend these dissertations to the thoughtful attention of all Christians.

The first essay deals with the "Visible Church of Christ;" and while claiming for the Church in its primitive days a position which entitles it to be regarded as the type for after ages, yet acknowledges that the "forms" by which its "life" was expressed were not Divinely prescribed and fixed for all time. The writer further contends that, assuming the ordinances of the Lord's Supper and Baptism to exist, the Church is left free to adapt forms to the exigencies of each age and place, for even in the primitive age diversity of form co-existed with real unity.

The second essay, dealing with the "Unity of the Church," leads to conclusions somewhat similar, and shows that the true basis of unity will be found in mutual adherence to those truths which are in reality common to all Christian Churches, and which are not, therefore, the property of any one denomination. This unity is to be rendered visible by combined evangelical effort, the necessity for which, the writer supposes, will increase with the coming of the final conflict with error; and those churches which thus manifest the spirit of Christian unity will be best prepared for that conflict, which, indeed, seems to be even now impending.

The writer of the third essay treats of "Christian Moral

Science," and with great ability presents an interesting though elaborate view of Christian morality as connected with the welfare of humanity and the redemptive work of Christ.

The last essay is intended to show the practicability of a general Christianization of the people, apart from ecclesiastical and denominational forms of Church order, and by means of "an intermediate organization that will enable the Church, without disturbing present ecclesiastical arrangements, to contemplate in united thought and purpose her great work, and to attempt its entire achievement with united, economised resources." This organization is shown to be the "Christian Moral Science Association."

The November number of the *Catholic Christian Moralist and Systematic Benefactor* is occupied with an account of a tour in America, undertaken by the indefatigable promoter of the movement, the Rev. Dr. Cather. It would seem from his account that several leading men in the American churches have warmly espoused the cause, and his visit must be regarded as a success. The matter is thus fairly before the public, and meetings in connection with the Association have recently been held in London, Manchester, and elsewhere. We do not doubt that there are many loving spirits who have ardently longed for greater unity in the Church of Christ, who see in this Association a grand *desideratum*,—in fact "the missing link" between the churches and their work. There are others, however, with perhaps quite as real a desire for true unity, though it may be with somewhat less enthusiasm, who regard the project as Utopian, or at all events premature. But, in addition to both these classes, there is unquestionably a still larger number who, while unwilling to take any immediate step towards the modification of existing denominational arrangements, or to identify themselves with an Association outside the denominations, will yet welcome any scheme which professes to point out a basis of united action for the good of our common Christianity. To such we commend the study of the volume we have referred to, and have no doubt that its effect will be, if not to secure adhesion to the plans and objects of the Association, yet to lessen in some degree the apparent importance of many denominational distinctions; and, in the face of the multiform attacks on our common faith, to place in a clearer and stronger light the duty incumbent upon all Christians, viz., to count every denominational interest subordinate to the defence and advancement of the interests of the whole Church of Jesus Christ.

We do not think, however, that the visible unity of the

Church will ever be realised by any one of the numerous modes which, in the present day, claim our attention. But any movement which leads us to look for its realisation in the field of practical effort, resulting from the reception of truths already common to all, is surely in the right direction, and should command our sympathy.

That the Church of Christ was designed to be a living unity cannot be questioned by any careful student of the New Testament. That it was intended to be organically and visibly one —one in government and in form—is not so clearly evident. While we believe that the unity of Christendom ought to be so visible as to make a definite impression upon the world, still we hold that all this may co-exist with great varieties of denominational form.

But is the division of the Church of Christ into denominations so great an evil as is frequently supposed? We think not; albeit that it is fashionable now amongst "liberal" Christians to decry denominationalism, and to speak of "sects" and "parties" with the utmost detestation and abhorrence. One of the most formidable of the modern crusades against "sects" is prosecuted by some who, while repudiating the term, manifest the spirit of sectarianism, and that of the most exclusive kind. While professing to seek the destruction of "sects," they are, in reality, adding another to the number. Refusing to connect themselves with any existing denomination, they hold aloof from all organization and discipline—the "Communists" of the ecclesiastical world. With them the individual is everything—the society nothing; atoms in the religious world they lack that attraction of cohesion which might form them into usefulness and beauty.

Whilst writing these lines our attention is directed to the words of a writer in a recent religious periodical—words so illustrative of this point that we cannot but quote them; "Perhaps few tracts are better known and more generally popular than the doggrel entitled 'No Sect in Heaven;' and yet we have little doubt that it has been productive of more mischief than any other religious publication of the same size. Of the things which give joy to our anticipations of heaven, few are more blessed than the thought that there all diversities incident to our present imperfect condition will cease to exist. . . . . So far, then, we have no fault to find with 'No Sect in Heaven.' But inasmuch as it subtilely and speciously represents good and pious men as hoping to enter heaven *because of their peculiarities* rather than through Him who alone is the Way, we altogether object

both to its teaching and to its spirit. To picture Charles Wesley, for instance, as essaying 'the river' depending upon his 'manuscripts,' is to slander the memory of him who believed and sang and taught—

> 'Other refuge have I none,
> Hangs my helpless soul on Thee.'

When it is insinuated that Wesleyans trust in their hymns, Episcopalians in their 'robes,' Baptists in their immersion, and so on, the error may seem too patent to require serious refutation; but meanwhile multitudes, misled by the statement, remain outside the pale of churches to which they would find it to their benefit, and even safety, to be attached."

From a quarter directly opposite to that occupied by these advocates for disintegration, comes another outcry against the "denominations," namely, from those who maintain the theory of "comprehension," and desire to see all sects and parties comprehended in a vast organization, say a "National Church," embracing within its area all the churches already existing. The eyes of these seekers after ecclesiastical unity are dazzled with the vision of a colossal organization, containing within the bounds of its uniformity of government the utmost variety of opinion in relation to many doctrines of the Christian faith. But would not this be merely an *outward* unity after all? And would we not be just as far as ever from the realization of the true unity of the Church?

Of course we do not contend that under given conditions it would be impossible thus to "comprehend" existing churches in a wide and spreading organization. Such comprehension is not only conceivable, but there are many persons who think they are on the eve of seeing it. But supposing it to exist, what would be the result? Just this: that the peace of such a community could be secured in two ways only—first, by imposing silence on all teachers of doctrines about which there were serious divisions of opinions; or secondly, by conceding to every one the full right to teach and defend his own views, even though there should be the greatest diversity, nay opposition, in the general teaching thus presented to the whole Church. The first of these methods is so utterly impossible in practice, and so contrary to the principles of Protestantism, that it could hardly be adopted. So long as the "right of private judgment" exists, and the doctrines of theology are derived from the Word of God, instead of the degrees of Councils, there will naturally be diversity of opinion concerning revealed truths. And while this is so, as it will probably

be to the end of time, neither uniformity of belief nor silence as to points of serious difference can be possible.

The other method, strange as it may seem, has a number of advocates. They see nothing objectionable in a system which would employ one man to teach that the sacrificial atonement of Christ is but a figure of speech; another that there is a true "sacrifice of the mass;" and a third, that eternal punishment is a fiction. A congregation would have to listen with the utmost complacence alike to the Unitarian of to-day and to the Trinitarian of the succeeding one. The Arminian would have to be satisfied with the Calvinism proclaimed by one preacher, and the Calvinist would have to enjoy as best he could the teachings of the broadest Arminianism from the same pulpit by another. A profound chaos would reign in the theological world; and yet, because all these different forms of teaching happened to be included in one great organization, the admirers of "comprehension" would see nothing but perfect order, and pronounce the whole to be "very good." We, however, are not yet convinced that the question of the Church's unity will be so easily settled.

Very great misconception exists generally relative to the unity of the Church, and many are the delusions under which great numbers of even thoughtful and intelligent Christians seem to labour respecting it. One very prevalent notion is, that there was unity of faith and form in the Church from the Apostolic age down to the Reformation; and that the Reformation whatever good it may have accomplished otherwise, is certainly chargeable with the "variations" which have characterised the Church since that time. But surely the most casual student of ecclesiastical history must see that there is not the slightest foundation for such an idea. True, there was a kind of visible unity in the Church of that period, but it was simply unity of government, and not of faith. Every single article of the Catholic creed was the subject of fierce and long-continued controversy. The passive acquiescence of an ignorant people in dogmas elaborated by an ignorant hierarchy is a poor symptom of unity of faith, and yet such was the unity even of the ascendant party in the Church. But looking over the borders of the so-called Catholic pale, we ask why are the numerous bodies of Christians—such as the Syrian, Armenian, Nestorian, and Greek Churches—excluded from the visible Church of that day? Surely they had as good a right to be considered Christians as the community which acknowledged the Pope of Rome as its head. But to concede this point would be to confess that there

was no unity of faith in the Church, and therefore these and all who do not consent to the dogmas of the ascendant party are excluded from the number of the "faithful."

It is perhaps because of the prevalence of the notion to which we have referred, that so many persons are fascinated with the appearance of unity presented by the Roman Catholic Church. The boast of unity has been so frequently made, and that with such audacious reiteration, that many Protestants really believe it to be true. Nothing, however, can be more unfounded than such an assertion. Neither in the period before the Reformation nor in that which has elapsed since, has there been unity in the Romish Church. Who that reads carefully the history of the Councils, and especially of the latest one, can fail to observe that her boasted unity has been purchased by fraud, flattery, and persecution—by base pandering to the arrogant assumptions of pride and ambition—by the stifling of all free and independent inquiry—and by cowardly concessions to the claims of pontiffs who have blasphemously sought to be invested with attributes which belong alone to the Eternal God?

The boasted unity of Rome is one of the most transparent falsehoods possible. True, there is to a certain extent an outward uniformity which may by some persons be confounded with unity, but it is a uniformity dearly purchased when attained at the cost of the suppression of free thought and liberty of speech. And even with all her precautions, the divisions in the Romish Church can no longer be kept secret. Witness the rivalry amongst the various religious orders; the Old Catholic movement of Germany; and, more recently still, the resentment of many of the French clergy at the command of the Pope that they should not only teach, but sincerely believe the dogma of Papal Infallibility. The external unity of the Church of Rome is rendered possible only by the existence of a dominant power which calls liberty of conscience heresy, and free inquiry a sin; which visits dissentients with summary punishment, and, should they persist in their opinions, with excommunication and disgrace. While Protestant Christendom holds no authority higher than the Bible, and no right dearer than that of unfettered thought, such external unity as that presented by Romanism is utterly impossible.

Those, therefore, who seek the unity of Christendom by cherishing the hope that there may yet be an agreement in faith and doctrine, and a oneness of ecclesiastical government in the Church of the future, which must sooner or later bring within its pale all who now hold different opinions and form

distinct organizations, must be content to see their efforts frustrated and their hopes blighted. As it has been, so it will be. Universal agreement in doctrine never has existed in the Church, and probably never will. None of the ancient creeds of Christendom commands anything like universal acceptance. No symbol, however hallowed by the reverence of ages, is adequate to represent the faith of all Christians. Nor can we expect to see the unity of the Church brought about by means of ecclesiastical authority. That authority has failed to produce unanimity in the past, and will not be likely to succeed better in the future. Inquiring spirits are not likely to be silenced by subordination to Church government, and the wilfulness of the human mind will refuse to be curbed by the reins of ecclesiastical authority. If, within the bounds of that authority, there exists no longer a refuge for the honest seeker after truth, then he will go outside those limits; and the spell of the charmed circle once broken, others may follow him.

There is a method of securing unity in the Church which has been proposed by some as worthy of a trial. It is to secure as far as possible the exercise of a spirit of Christian love. If agreement in doctrine is impossible—if onenesss of ecclesiastical government is impracticable, because possible only at the sacrifice of truth and liberty—if the theory of "comprehension" must prove destructive to the best interests of Christianity, then what if we try what unanimity of feeling and sentiment will do? Let us, by mutual exhortation, prayer, and fellowship, show at all events that "these Christians love one another."

This is a step in the right direction, and is, we think, nearer to the true method of attaining unity than any of the others. But our objection to it is this, that it does not go far enough. In fact it is more sentimental than practical. Who does not see, for instance, that clergymen and ministers of all evangelical denominations may meet once a week or once a year at a "Union" or an "Evangelical Alliance" prayer meeting, and, each having taken part in it, may go forth again to their separate work without further practical recognition, or united effort for the cause of Christ? The love, and sympathy, and desire for fellowship, so long pent up, break forth in the warmth of a "Union prayer meeting," and leave nothing behind to animate to practical and united work in the world outside. We believe that until something additional to the profession of Christian love and sympathy be found in the churches generally, their union is more nominal than real. What the world needs to-day is a practical, rather than a sentimental, evidence of the unity of the Church.

We hail, therefore, the appearance of "Science and the Gospel," not because we pledge ourselves to an approval of its scheme in detail, but because it is the symptom of the awakening of the Church to the fact that in the sphere *of united practical effort* for the extension of our Saviour's kingdom, and in that sphere alone, lies the secret of the power which is to unite the Churches of the future, if not into one community, yet in the bonds of holy love and earnest work.

We hold, then, that the problem of the Church's unity is to be solved, not by the obliteration of denominational distinctions—so far as they represent principles—but by mutual recognition of each other's position and work, and ready co-operation in questions affecting the Church as a whole. Let denominational principles be ever subordinate to the interests of Christianity in general, especially as regards its conflict with the many forms of error and infidelity which characterize our time.

The sooner we cease repining at the nominal "divisions" of Protestantism, and concentrate our energies in seeking to heal its real and practical divisions, the better. Right or wrong, denominationalism exists, and we do not see anything in that fact inconsistent with the true unity of the Church. It has its dangers we grant, and they are neither few nor small. Foremost amongst them may be that of a narrow and exclusive spirit which swallows up the interests of Christianity in the claims of the party or denomination, and makes us look askance on any good work done by others, until it has been brought to the test of our own standards of faith and practice. Another evil, perhaps not less great, is the danger of giving undue attention and prominence to the points which separate us from our fellow Christians, and too little to those points on which we are at one with them. The system of truth becomes disturbed, and truths and principles—important enough, no doubt, to us as denominations, but comparatively unimportant in relation to the whole scheme of Christianity—are invested with a false and exaggerated greatness and weight. It is one of the most difficult things to overcome these dangers of denominationalism.

But may not each section of the Church have its own peculiar mission? We think so; and the advantages which accrue to Christianity as a whole from the fact of each denomination being, to a greater or less extent, the guardian of some special truth or aspect of a truth, may be very great indeed. Besides, we are more likely to reach a greater degree of unanimity in opinion by the preparatory process of investiga-

tion and searching controversy which are inseparable from denominationalism. Principles, too, will take a firmer hold upon us. The *esprit de corps* will exert its influence in endearing certain truths to our hearts. The association with kindred minds will not be too wide to weaken our convictions, nor yet too narrow to encourage self-opinionation. And in the field of practical effort, the spirit of Christian brotherhood, with all its strengthening and cheering power, has its best and truest development in the ties of church fellowship which spring from denominational distinctions.

Granting, then, for the moment, that a final, visible, and corporate unity is the proper goal of all our efforts as Christians seeking greater unity in the Church, we think that the denominational system of the present is more likely to lead to it than the formation of a colossal organization which, by means of ecclesiastical government would, even while tolerating divergent and contradictary opinions, only simulate true unity, by covering within its fair exterior the rottenness and corruption of internal decay and death.

To "follow peace" is no doubt a Christian duty, but so likewise is contending earnestly for the faith. Let us, therefore, while attached to existing denominations maintain our distinctive truths in a fearless, but not an intolerant spirit; and while giving no undue prominence to those points upon which we differ, let us exalt and magnify, in the spirit of true Christian brotherhood, those upon which we are agreed. We must learn to believe that a spiritual unity is better than an external one. Until more of the spirit of mutual recognition pervades the Churches they are scarcely ripe for "comprehension." The day may come when many formal barriers of division may be broken down, but it can be hastened only by the true, loving, and hearty co-operation of all the Churches in every possible department of work for Christ. Anything which will shew how this practical co-operation may be realized will be a lasting benefit to the Church.

T.

ART. V.—A PEOPLE'S BLUE-BOOK.

LEST the title prefixed to this article should have the effect of warding off any whose eye may happen to fall upon it, and who, not unnaturally, have an instinctive aversion to Blue-Books, we hasten to assure them that the one which now lies before us is an exception to its class. If not altogether, it is well-nigh, exempt from the proverbial dulness of such compilations. Barring a few pages of statistics with which we shall not trouble our readers, and with which the compilers really need not have troubled either themselves or us, there is nothing particularly repellant about it. On the contrary, it contains much that can scarcely fail to arrest the attention of the most casual reader, while to those at all interested in the industrial classes of this country, and who wish to know how they stand as compared with those of other countries, it is little less than fascinating. We may further state that we have no covert design to serve, that it is not our purpose to manipulate the facts and figures here set down for the support of any preconceived theory. We are not without our thoughts, or even theories, but it is not our intention to introduce them here. The task we have imposed upon ourselves is simply to attempt to rescue the Blue-Book before us from the oblivion to which Blue-Books generally appear to be destined, and by extending the very valuable information it contains to enlist the sympathies of a still larger number in a subject which, especially at the present time, can scarcely be otherwise described than as of primary importance. We are not, of course, ignorant of the fact that this journal does not circulate largely among those whose interests would seem to be most concerned in such a subject, but we write in the hope of serving, in some measure, those who, not unfrequently, are called upon to advise with and counsel such.

The overstocked state of the labour market has for some time past led our more prominent political and social economists to cast about for some means of remedying existing evils, and of preventing, if possible, their recurrence in the future. The happy idea occurred to the late Lord Clarendon that the services of our diplomatic and consular agents abroad might be advantageously enlisted in the attempt to solve the problem. The practical outcome of the idea was the issue of a circular addressed to those gentlemen, requesting information upon the

general condition of the working classes in the countries in which they resided. This was followed in June, 1870, by another requiring further particulars (1) in regard to the purchase power of money in foreign countries as compared with England; (2) in regard to matters connected with the preservation of health; and (3) in regard to the quantity of work executed in the several departments of labour; these heads embracing other minor particulars. The result is the Blue-Book which stands at the head of these pages, consisting of some ninety-three reports drawn up by many consuls, vice-consuls, or others, resident in some thirty different countries, either from official statistics, reliable authorities, or from personal observation. As we remember to have remarked in a former case, and as is perfectly natural, they are characterised by a great diversity both of length and style. To some of the writers the task has evidently been a most irksome one, to be got rid of with as much haste and in as few words as was compatible with the assumed importance of the subject at home; while others coming to the work *con amore* have produced papers as readable and as interesting as a book of travel, which, after all, is not greatly to be wondered at, perhaps, seeing that among the contributors are Charles Lever, W. Gifford Palgrave, and others, whose very names are a guarantee equally against dulness as against inefficiency. We may add, *en passant*, that, in the absence we suppose of other matter, some of the writers have enlivened their reports by a reference to subjects which, although somewhat irrelevant are, nevertheless, not devoid of interest. We may instance the case of Mr. Severn, who gives us the "reason why" of the Romans having such superior voices:—

"The very fine quality of the Roman voices is attributed to the custom of the mothers swaddling their babies, and when the mothers are employed out of doors the baby is suspended from its back to a nail in the wall, and allowed to cry for several hours together, which continued act of crying exercises and forms the vocal organs in an extraordinary way."

The following rather curious hygienic rules are those by which Consul Paton (Ragusa) secures to himself the blessings of perfect health:—

"On rising, cold bath, or sea bath if possible; breakfast of lemonade and dry toast; half an-hour's sleep before dinner; copious dinner at two p.m., with wine of the country largely mingled with water; burnt barley as coffee after dinner; no tea or supper, and no tea, coffee, or spirits taken on any occasion whatever."

The drink most affected by the Russian peasantry is "watkey," or as we have elsewhere seen it written "vodky." Mr. Barrow gives us his estimate of it in these terms:—

"As to the Russian 'watkey,' intolerably detestable to the unhabituated, it is, like all other vices—

'Of such hideous mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with its face,
Men first endure, then pity, then embrace.'

In corroboration of which I may remark that even ship-masters who, in their wooden houses, like birds on a branch, are here to-day and gone to-morrow, on arriving taste the far-famed 'watkey,' pronounce it detestable, and throw it away. A second and third trial enables them to endure it; they subsequently pity those who have fallen victims to an immoderate use of it, and finally—as pity is akin to love—they embrace it, until at length 'watkey's' their only wear; and I have seen men drink, and heard others affirm, that from being hale and hearty as when they arrived, after a few months' detention, they have become grey-headed, stupified, and rapidly approaching the last stage of *delirium tremens*. It is aquafortis, and more injurious than any spirit I know of."

Proceeding to the subject matter of these reports we shall deal with it in the order following—speaking (1) of those countries which, strictly speaking, have no working class, and which offer no inducement to persons of that class to settle there; (2) of such as present openings—of a kind—and which may be advantageously adopted by certain persons under certain circumstances; and (3) of such as have a sufficient, if not a redundant, working class, but from which our own countrymen have something to learn. There are others which fall properly under none of these heads, but which in no way call for special remark.

Under the first head we include Greece, Morocco, Persia, Turkey, &c. The English artizan who should emigrate to any of these countries in the hope of bettering himself would be ill-advised indeed; the few advantages he might possess under exceptional circumstances, and even those qualified, barely compensating for the isolation of his position, and the manifold difficulties with which he would have to contend. Take, for example, Greece. His advantages would consist in his being able (supposing him sure of suitable and constant employment) to demand high wages, and in the fact that the purchase power of money is some fifty per cent. greater than in Britain. But, on the other hand, not only would he be

placed at an immense disadvantage in consequence of his ignorance of the language and the antipathy of the Greeks to foreigners, but the high price of clothing, owing to its having to be imported, would prove a formidable set-off against his high rate of wages, in addition to which lodgings are dear and difficult to find, and when found are wretchedly bad. We need to quote but one pregnant sentence from Mr. Ongley's report to show the unattractive nature of that classic country from a working man's point of view:—"Although the population of Malta is quite as redundant as that of Great Britain, still, Maltese do not emigrate to Greece." True the aversion of the Greeks to manual labour necessitates the employment of foreign labour, but it is chiefly supplied by Albanians, men who can live on olives and bread, and who take a small room where eight or ten sleep together.

Spain, Portugal, Persia, Morocco, and Turkey are all, almost, equally uninviting. Skilled labour is but little in demand, and as there is in all these countries an almost universal jealousy of foreigners, with a consequent preference for native labour, and for *cheapness* before all things else, wages are low, living is poor, and accommodation bad. The smart and pertinent remarks of Mr. Percy Ffrench in reference to Spain are not inapplicable to the other countries embraced under this head:—

"If they (British mechanics) are to live among Spaniards they must eat and drink what they happen to find, and wear whatever clothes they may happen to possess. . . . All lodging would be of the simplest description, four walls and plenty of ventilation, owing to the absence of glass windows. Drainage and other details of advanced civilization are here unknown, and all lands in the vicinity of a river are hotbeds of fever during the summer and autumn."

Mr. Reade, again, mentions a state of things as existing in Scutari which, we fancy, would have little attraction for the peace-loving Englishman:—

"A Scutarian ploughs with his firelock on his back; he digs with it always near him, and no one moves about without his arms. This is in the country. In the towns a similar state of things exists. The shopkeeper and artizan have always their pistols in their belts; in short little more need to be added when it is stated that many of the very mendicants are armed. The anomalous condition of the place will therefore be easily imagined."

Both Mr. Jenner (Persia) and Mr. Palgrave (Turkey) make exceptions in favour of *colonies* of labourers. The former,

indeed, thinks that "one or two workmen from each craft might succeed in making a fortune *if they could induce their Persian employers to pay them;*" but the latter holds out no hope whatever to individuals, not one of the many European artizans, smiths, carpenters, &c., who have gone thither to try their fortunes, and whom he had known, having been able to hold his own. Egypt is, on the whole, perhaps something better than the foregoing places; for, notwithstanding that it is essentially agricultural, considerable numbers of Europeans are engaged in the building and other trades, and as mechanics in the service of the Government and of private persons. Engineers occasionally do well, such as would get but £8 or £10 per month in England being able to make from £20 to £30, sometimes with lodgings in addition. But although large sums are frequently made whilst executing some contract job, work is of very uncertain continuance, and unless a man succeed in obtaining other employment immediately, or at once leave the country, his latter end is not unlikely to be worse than his first.

Brazil comes under our second head, of those places which present favourable openings to certain persons under certain circumstances. *Labor ipse voluptas* is no motto of the native Brazilian any more than it is that of the Greek, while the idea of its savouring of religion or divinity represents the very polarity of his belief. This arises partly from the fact that he can manage to subsist without it or nearly so, and partly from all manual labour having formerly been done by slaves (as it is still to some extent), but principally, we suspect, from his inherent laziness. And although of late years the introduction of railways, machinery, and foreign labour has had a tendency to draw him out, and to induce him to apply himself to industrial pursuits, yet he shows little or no capacity for becoming a skilled workman, lacking application, and being for the most part indifferent and careless in the extreme. Wherever skilled labour is required, therefore, it has to be performed by Europeans; and while there is no great or general demand at present, it is increasing and must continue to increase, and certain provinces are, even now, not unworthy of attention. But the concluding sentences of a very careful report by Mr. Drummond-Hay, of the provinces of Pará and Amazonas, are such as will enable our readers to judge for themselves:—

"In conclusion, I have to observe that any intellectual, skilful, and sober artizan would be, and is, certain of remunerative employment in Pará. He would have difficulties at first to contend with, such as the language, house accommodation, and occasional slight

illness, until he became acclimatized and accustomed to the usages of the country. But if he was a persevering man, not wasteful in his expenditure, not too urgent in his want of society, and lived with regular, quiet habits, avoiding the many vices which afflict strangers in Pará, he would, as a rule, be able considerably to better his circumstances, and rise in a brief period in reputation, even above his class in England."

The exchangeable value of money, it should be stated, can only be reckoned at a little more than one half; but even then, Mr. Dundas, who writes respecting the province of Sao Paulo, considers that, with economy, even a married man would be able to save one-fourth of his earnings. And while for that portion that he spent the purchase power would be only one half or so, his savings he could convert into sterling at the current rate of exchange, and so get the real value of his money. If a man go out under contract his success is well-nigh assured. Then, provided he be careful to secure a written agreement, containing *inter alia* a stipulation for a free passage home on the completion of his contract, if he should not care to remain (an item of the first importance in the case of all foreign countries), an active, intelligent young man, desirous of seeing the world and of pushing his way, might reap life-long advantages from such a course, probably finding himself before long in a quite exceptional position; the risks to health being, for the most part, next to *nil*, if only he avoid excess, and adopt such precautions as most naturally present themselves. *Apropos* to which we may quote a common-sense piece of advice given by Consul Vereker (Charente) to those who may contemplate a residence in a climate other then their own:—"Watch the system of living prevalent, wherever you may be, amongst the residents of your class, and conform yourselves thereto as nearly as your feelings, habits, and position will permit."

Under the conditions just named, Chili is promising, and Peru exceptionally attractive, the climate of the latter being most benignant, and the wages of skilled mechanics and artizans averaging £130 a year—upholsterers receiving as much as £156. True, here also, the purchase power of money is not nearly so great as at home, but as the principal companies adopt the plan of providing accommodation for their *employés*, if a man take with him a sufficient outfit to last his time of contract (generally three or four years) he may, if he will, save £80 or £90 a year. We speak now of single men. It has sometimes happened that those who, during their first term of service, have left wife and family at home have, on a

second engagement, taken them with them, but have found the increased cost of living under such circumstances to absorb the whole of their earnings.

Under this head, too, we include Russia, not so much because it properly belongs as that it is popularly supposed to belong hereto. And it is true that at different times considerable numbers of English artizans and mechanics have taken up their abode in that inhospitable region for a longer or shorter period. It is very doubtful, however, if many of them would care to repeat their visit. Consul Stevens's Report at all events is not likely to relieve the labour market at home much by causing a rush in that direction. We deem the facts he communicates of such importance that we prefer Mr. Stevens to speak for himself:—

"Recent Russian resolves require all Russian enterprise to employ no foreigners or foreign material if they can be avoided; and it is notorious that foreigners are only sought where and when the Empire fails in supply, and then the most binding contracts are useless once the foreigner's art is learnt tolerably well by natives, who are quick at imitation; the smallest pretext is made an excuse for dismissing the foreigners; he is arbitrarily dismissed, and his only hope for even moderate redress lies in the influence and pains-taking of his Consul, who in nine cases out of ten refers the applicant to the civil tribunals, where no sane man would venture a law-suit unless he resolves to settle down in the country ten or fifteen years to await an uncertain issue. It is upwards of ten years since an Englishman, who with a Russian partner set up a fine flour mill in this town (Nicolaieff), which, once in working order, the Russian tried to buy him out of; finding this impossible, the Russian dragged the Englishman into the tribunals; the mill was closed with everything perishable and imperishable in it; the doors were sealed, and so they remained up to this morning, when I drove past the establishment, and so probably matters will remain for another ten years. In the meantime, the unfortunate Englishman who, believing the power of his adversary was in the fact of his nationality, became a Russian subject, and, after spending his last penny on his just suit, has been reduced to the purchase of a donkey, and assuming the garb of a Dulcamaru, travels from fair to fair, selling bread-and-soap pills as a specific against ague. I could quote volumes of cases of unfair and arbitrary treatment to which Englishmen, decoyed out of England, in some instances with capital and families, have been subjected. Mr. George Furness's case is too recent and well-known to require further comment than the passing remark that he was quarrelled with the very moment the Russians learned to pave the streets of Odessa for themselves; and he is now in the Russian tribunals, adding to his ruinous losses daily, with every right on his side, but not the same conviction as to the final redress which will be awarded him.

"Mr. William Millar, the son of an English general,—who has for more than twenty-five years instructed, as superintending engineer of the Nicolaiev arsenal, nearly every one of the engineers and engine-drivers attached to the Black Sea naval force,—resides at this very moment a few doors from me in *quasi* poverty, having been shelved on the reduction of the naval establishment here in 1866, to make way for his foreman, received the scanty bounty of £65, and that only on the kind request and assistance of Her Majesty's Ambassador, and considers himself most fortunate (after being upwards of a year without employ, without means to get to England with his family, and actually lacking bread for it) to have obtained a temporary Government job at something short of £25 per month, and that, too, fast drawing to a close. . . . . Respectable men of all classes and callings have, during my long sojourn in this country, applied to me, smarting under treatment such as I have described. With every possible will to aid them, beyond a compromise, in which my applicants, as a rule, have come worst off, nothing was possible; and although I consider that there is vast opening for the introduction of labour from without, I should indeed be sorry to recommend any one to immigrate, however binding he may make his compact upon a Russian employer."

It will by this time have become evident to our readers that for openings for the majority in anything like adequate numbers, we must turn from the East to the West, from the Old World to the New. If social problems at home are to be solved by the emigration of our surplus population—and it is undoubtedly one of the readiest helps to the solution of some of them—notwithstanding all that can reasonably be urged against it, and notwithstanding our decided objection to state-assisted emigration, it is to our Australian colonies, Canada, and the United States that we must look. Here there is at least room for them, and will be for years to come. Concerning both the former these Reports are, of course, silent, treating only of the latter, and the latter it is which holds out the best prospects to the mass as yet, because of the great diversity of trades and manufactures, and because also of the great demand for labour of nearly all kinds consequent upon the rapid development of the country. But even here caution is necessary. Fortune, consistent in her inconsistency, does not shower her favours indiscriminately upon all. The heavens do not rain newly-minted coins there any more than they do here, and the streets are paved—if paved at all—with granite and not with gold. Of course the statement is a very obvious one, but necessary to be constantly repeated nevertheless, because of the many who persist *per fas et nefas* in believing as they hope, that as soon as they set foot on that enchanted

land they shall surely stumble upon some inexhaustible mine of wealth. Hence the wisdom of the foot-note appended to his Report by Mr. Hemans:—

"It is a common notion among English emigrants that the moment they set foot on American soil work and high wages may be had for the mere asking. This is a great mistake. If a man goes straight to the Far West, indeed, he will have no difficulty in getting an engagement as a farm labourer or a drover. But in the Eastern States he may remain weeks, even months, without employment, unless he has friends on the spot to push his interests. If the emigrant has such friends, well and good; otherwise some capital to fall back upon while waiting for his chance of employment is absolutely necessary."

It should be borne in mind, too, that the different States are not equally attractive, nor equally capable of absorbing the labour that may flow into them. In Buffalo (Erie County) for instance, Mr. Hemans believes the number of skilled labourers to be pretty nearly equal to the demand, while as regards unskilled labour the place has, thanks to the constant influx of Irish and Germans, reached the point of saturation. But while this is the case in some districts, it is not by any means so universally. As the Americans are never tired of reminding us, it is "a great country, Sir!" and while the labour market may be stocked in one part of it, there are other parts in which there exists a great demand for labour, both skilled and unskilled, for:—

"The Americans rarely work as labourers on farms or in mines. If they cannot succeed as small proprietors, they resort to the cities, and embark in the lucrative but demoralizing trade of politics, and other urbane occupations; and, failing these, they migrate to the Far West, where lands can be purchased from the Government at nominal prices."

Of the Southern States Consul Walker reports but unfavourably:—

"Artizans from Great Britain newly arrived meet with the greatest difficulty in obtaining employment, and in their distress they are often obliged to work for wages no greater than are paid to a common labourer; and they are, moreover, if unable to proceed to the Northern States in the summer season, exposed to dangers of climate, which it is submitted should for ever deter emigration from Great Britain and Ireland in this direction."

Notwithstanding the studied brevity with which we have dismissed the consideration of the several places included un-

der the former heads, we cannot deal so largely as we had wished with those embraced under the remaining head without greatly exceeding our prescribed limits. We the more regret this as we had hoped, despite the disclaimer with which we set out, to have pointed a moral or two, or rather allowed these reports to do this for themselves. We will endeavour, however, to make the best possible use of the space that remains by obtruding ourselves upon the reader as little as possible.

The first point to which we would call attention is the unanimous testimony borne by the several writers to the thrift and providence of the working-classes of the Continent. From France, Holland, Italy, Prussia, Saxony, Saxe-Coburg, and Switzerland we have the same testimony, viz.—that with less wages, and in many cases with fewer advantages of other kinds, they frequently rise to a higher social position than those of the same class at home.

"The French," says Consul Vereker, "from their extreme moderation in food, their economical mode of dress, their sobriety and providence, are able to live cheaper than a British workman would contentedly do; and many things which an English workman would consider as indispensable necessaries, a Frenchman of the same class would look upon as useless luxuries; and therefore French workmen are often found to save yearly a respectable portion upon wages which would barely be found sufficient for the maintenance of a British workman in the same position."

And this is only what is said in other words of the industrial classes of the other places mentioned. Belgium, unhappily, is the exception which proves the rule, the beer-swilling propensity, with its concomitant evils, causing it to bear a but too close resemblance to our own country. "The greatest number living without an eye to the future and, as it were, from hand to mouth, are dependent upon retailers and petty hucksters, who make huge profits on the credit system." Of course we all know to what such mismanagement naturally leads, but few, we imagine, will be prepared for the astounding statement that out of a population of 4,529,560 souls no less than 900,000 (one-fifth) are inscribed on the lists of poor relief. We have a state of morals revealed, too, or rather, a lack of morality, which is melancholy in the extreme. "The majority of the girls who work in the coal pits have no great sense of decency, and seldom marry without having had two or three children previously."* But the Belgian is, nevertheless, not

* It is only fair to add, and we are only too glad to be able to do so, that Consul Grattan reports much more favourably of Antwerp.

without his redeeming features. He drinks, but he does not quarrel when in his cups; on the contrary, one of the surest signs that he has overstepped the mark is that he begins to embrace and dance with his fellow-workmen. He is no patron of the pawnshop; preferring to keep his Sunday shirt—without which a Belgian is poor indeed—well-brushed and neatly-folded in his own wardrobe at home. He does not strike; having long adopted the wiser plan of submitting all disputes between himself and his employer to a Council of Conciliation. This is an institution which, known in Belgium and France (where it first took its rise in 1806) as the *Conseil de Prud'-hommes*, and in Germany as the "Gewerbe-Gericht," has long done good service on the Continent. During the year 1869, for instance, the number of cases submitted to the Belgian Tribunal was 207; of these 179 were disposed of by the Committee of Conciliation, and 28 were sent up to the Council, of which number 20 were amicably settled, and six were tried, judgment in two cases being given by default. As one who is well acquainted with their working, and who has long striven to establish them on English soil, has said,—"The effect of such a tribunal upon the life and habits of the artizan is obvious. It not only relieves him from the necessity of holding meetings with his co-workers for the purpose of resisting small or great acts of oppression on the part of his employer, but it brings him into contact and close relationship with the latter, so that the grievances, wants, and peculiarities of each class become known to the other, the rough places are made smooth, and the association between them is freed from those asperities which unfortunately characterize the relations between capital and labour at home." And it is, we think, much to be regretted that a kindred institution should have been so long in making its way among us, the tardiness with which it is being adopted reflecting credit neither upon employers nor employed.

There is another institution, too, to which we must refer before leaving Belgium, which is, so far as we know, unique, viz., the "decoration" of the Belgian working-man.

"The word 'decoration' does not at once convey to the English reader the idea implied by the same word in French, and yet it is not easy otherwise to describe the badge of distinction (worn externally like the star of an order of knighthood attached by a tri-coloured ribbon, on the left breast) which was instituted in Belgium in the year 1847 as a special mode of rewarding skilful and meritorious artizans . . . . . It consists in an oblong badge of elegant workmanship of gold for the first class, and silver for the second,

relieved by a border of blue enamel and surmounted by a crown, and forms, attached to its ribbon, a handsome ornament. It is accompanied by an artistically engraved diploma, setting forth the name, occupation, and qualifications of the recipient, the same being usually framed and hung up in a conspicuous place in the artizan's dwelling. These decorations, which are greatly prized by working men, have had the two-fold effect of exciting as a stimulus to exertion on the part of the artizans, and of benefitting the masters by inducing good workmen to remain steadily in the same employ, the distinction being generally granted on the recommendation of the employers, and being looked upon as a reward for long and faithful services, as well as for good conduct and proved ability."

Coming to Germany we cannot but confess ourselves disappointed with the Report. Not only is Germany well furnished with Elementary Schools but with Technological also, besides possessing numerous institutions projected, supported, and managed exclusively by working-men themselves for mutual improvement and self-help. In fact, to none of his Continental *confrères* can the British workman turn for hints in this direction with greater advantage. Exceptions there are here, of course, as everywhere, but as a rule the German working-man does not waste his time in declaiming against the form of government under which he happens to be born, nor in devising elaborate schemes for making everybody happy without work; but with admirable self-dependence he seeks to fit himself intelligently to fill such positions as may open to him; in consequence of which wherever foreign skilled labour is employed the German element is almost certain to preponderate. Yet not one word of all this have we in the Report furnished by Mr. Petre, secretary of Embassy at Berlin; on the other hand we have upwards of thirty pages of dry statistics, the utility of which we must confess ourselves unable to discover.*

In the case of Switzerland we have a striking and happy contrast. Our readers will not need to be informed that there are those among our *soi-disant* social reformers who would fain persuade us that the one simple method of redressing all wrongs and securing all rights, so that everybody may be made contented and happy, every possible cause of complaint being removed, is to convert England into another Switzerland. Judging from the way in which this supposed *beau ideal* of what a country ought to be is held up, one would imagine that it fell short in nothing of that Utopia of which Sir Thomas

* Those who wish to know what the working-men of Germany are doing for themselves will find much interesting information in a little work by James Samuelson of Liverpool, entitled "The German Working Man." Longmans.

More dreamed. That such is the case we have yet to learn. Such, at all events, is not the impression made by Mr. Gould's Report, although manifestly written with the sincere desire to do full justice to the Swiss character and constitution, and of which we must say further that, in the compass, it gives by far the best and most lucid description of the constitution and working of the Model Republic we remember to have seen. As most reasonable people would naturally conclude, the very glowing accounts we receive of it from time to time require to be taken *cum grano salis.* Like every other it is a picture which has two sides, and that generally presented is by no means the worst, so that it is scarcely to be wondered at that it should prove taking. This is something like it:—In no other country is the land so equally divided among the people; in no other country do "the people" so distinctly govern themselves; so much is every man on a par with every other man, socially and politically, that a working *class* can scarcely be said to exist; the Switzer is educated as far as his ordinary requirements demand, and has at his disposal the means of perfecting his education if he only wills it; if he is ambitious he may aspire to any position of trust and influence which his energy and ability may bring within his reach; and he not unfrequently resides in his own cottage, cultivates with the assistance of his family the small patch of ground belonging to him, is the possessor of a cow or two or three goats, which at times find pasturage on the communal lands, and he can draw from the same sources the supply of wood required for household purposes. These facts set forth, as they commonly are, with a good deal of grandiloquence and with not a little colouring matter added, and seen too in the distance, have had the effect of producing on the minds of many in this country the impression that the Switzer is the happiest, most contented, and most prosperous of men, and that he owes all this, not to his own efforts but to the political institutions of his country. We will not say that he owes nothing to them, but this we will say, that what of his exceptional position he does not owe to force of circumstances, he owes more to his social and provident institutions than to his political, and more to his own industry and frugality than to either. It is no part of our plan to discuss his position as contrasted with that of the British workman, but if it were, and even supposing that there were no *per contra* in the case, we should wish for answers to questions such as these—How far the English workingman need fall short of his Swiss brother if—to use words which Mr. Gould uses of the Switzer—"*if he only wills it?*" How

far the majority of our countrymen would care to ply their craft one half the year and dig and delve the other—from necessity? and further, whether they would care to sacrifice their individuality and the freedom and independence enjoyed under a monarchy such as ours for the innumerable restraints of the communal system? with many others involved in these. He owes little to his country who cannot boast of some advantages which other countries cannot offer him, but the rose-coloured representations so frequently made of the country under consideration are beyond measure misleading. Let the reader judge for himself. Mr. Barry, of "New Social Movement" notoriety, writes in his "Workman's Wrongs and Workman's Rights:"—

"One-third of the wages of an Englishman is required for rent; and when wages fail, there is the ordeal of the casual ward before there is admission to the workhouse. In Switzerland there is for the most part no rent; and wages, whether sixpence a day or six shillings, is at all times surplusage—the subsistence of the Swiss workman being in part derived by his own hands from his own soil, and in part by the breeding of his own cattle."*

Mr. Gould says he needs these resources, as well as the assistance afforded by the innumerable philanthropic institutions of the country, to enable him to tide over "those formidable vicissitudes of fortune principally resulting from want of labour, &c.;" adding, "the frugal habits of all classes also *tend to deaden the sting of the privations* to which the working man has to submit in consequence of the smallness of his wages." Mr. Hepworth Dixon writes in his own clever way, effect being of more importance than exactness:—

"Observe the peasant's shed, the pastor's porch, the farmer's field: how clean that shed, how bright that porch, how orderly that field! You see no heaps of mess, you smell no hidden filth. Each article is in its place; and order reigns by virtue of some natural law."

Mr. Gould, again, says:—

"Their cottages are generally clean and comfortable, but, as in all cold climates, the ventilation is defective, and further, the smells from the dung often heaped up close to the very door and the liquid manure are at times most offensive."

* We did not deem it necessary in the text, but on further consideration we think it may be as well here to remind the reader of Mr. Barry's exaggerated statement regarding rent, as well as to say that if the Swiss has no rent to pay (which is true only in part) he has a superabundance of taxes.

We may be allowed, too, to quote again from Mr. Samuelson:

"There (Switzerland) it was I first found indications of wide-spread intemperance. . . . The intemperance would no doubt be still greater in Switzerland were it not for the want of pecuniary means for indulgence, and the presence of those higher and more refined tastes—the love of music, for instance—which, as I have shown, operate so favourably in Germany, and the existence of cheap rational entertainments. Here we first read in the rules of a working-men's institute that 'it is forbidden to supply wine to members who have already taken enough alcoholic liquor.' There the words 'overcrowding,' 'filth,' and 'cholera' are found bracketed together as with us."

But with all their drawbacks—and they are many—there is much about this people to admire, and much that is worthy of imitation. They have long since arrived at the conviction that the education of the masses is the only sound basis of a State with free institutions, and the most effective lever to raise the moral as well as material condition of a nation. To this one purpose Switzerland devoted, in the year 1864, close upon 11,000,000 francs (£440,000), or upwards of 13¼ per cent. of her total revenue from all sources.

"One of the many advantages possessed by the Swiss workingman over his fellow competitors in other lands, especially in England, is that, owing to the education he has received, he is able to find in a variety of rational pastimes that necessary relaxation from work which the others are unfortunately but too often reduced to seek in vacant indolence or low debauchery. To provide him, therefore, with the means of spending his leisure hours at least pleasantly, if not usefully, and thus to save him, as far as possible, from falling into vicious habits, is the self-imposed task of numerous societies, not a few of which are founded by workmen themselves. Under their auspices local circulating libraries have been formed in many parts of the country, even in some of the most secluded rural communes, the works of which they are composed being carefully selected in order that they may suit the taste and position of those for whom they are more particularly intended. In 1866 the Canton of Geneva already possessed forty-three of these libraries, with 39,000 volumes, and that of Lucerne forty-one. The number in the remaining Cantons has not yet been ascertained. There are, moreover, numerous other public libraries, containing works of a much higher class, as well as museums in all the principal towns. Almanacs, reviews, and newspapers are likewise published for the special use of the working classes, and many of the daily papers give out on Sundays an extra sheet with the object of affording them additional reading matter. Lectures on the social and political questions of the day and other attractive subjects are frequently given, not only in the great centres

of population but also in the remote communes, where, in the absence of regular lecturers, the village clergyman or schoolmaster, and sometimes even ordinary workmen undertake this task. There are innumerable working-men's associations, which have some regular place of meeting, where books, periodicals, games, and refreshments are provided for the members, whose time is chiefly engaged in debating, getting up dramatic performances, and acquiring a knowledge of modern languages, book-keeping, drawing, arithemetic, history, &c. Much attention is devoted to music, both vocal and instrumental, as a means of innocent recreation, singing being taught in all the primary schools. There is hardly a village which does not possess one or more choral societies, and in many cases a brass band. The rural districts of the Canton of Lucerne may be cited as an example of the general taste for music, the beneficial effects of which cannot be too highly appreciated. In this little strip of territory there are no less than sixteen principal choral societies, seventeen musical societies, thirteen theatrical societies, and twenty-five brass bands. Lenzberg, a town of 2,000 inhabitants, could already, some years back, boast of possessing 200 pianos."*

Of trades unions and strikes we can speak but briefly, nor is it necessary to do otherwise, even were it desirable, since the various writers are, without exception, agreed as to their generally baneful influence and effects. They do, it is admitted, occasionally secure to the workman a slight increase in the rate of wages, or a diminution in the hours of labour, but it is at the expense of all kindly feeling between master and man, besides which it is found that, as a rule, both the time and money so obtained only favour demoralizing dissipation, and prove anything but a boon. So unfavourable is the impression produced in the Netherlands by the excess to which the system of strikes has been carried by many classes of workmen in England, and so general is the fear lest a system so baneful in its effects, and so prejudicial to the true interests of employers and employed, and so destructive to the good-feeling and friendly relations which should exist between them, should ever take root in that country, that English workmen would find a difficulty in obtaining remunerative employment there. Some time ago a mixed committee of masters and workmen met at Arnheim to discuss the question of wages, and with one brief passage from the Report in which they embodied their conclusions we will bring our quotations to a close—

"The reason that all wages are not alike is because all labour is not equally productive. The man who works better than his neigh-

* It is calculated that there are about 400,000 pianos in use in the British Isles, and about one million players.

bour will be better paid. The reward of labour is in constant proportion to its power. By how much the power is greater, by so much will the productiveness of the labour be greater, and the workman be better paid. Give the workman the opportunity of increasing his knowledge; let the School Board look after the workmen of the future; let industrial schools be formed for the purpose of fitting him for his work; and, lastly, let the workmen who show the greatest aptitude be enabled to go and see what is done in all countries, and obtain the stimulus of a noble ambition. . . . Above all, let the workmen stimulate one another into taking a pleasure and an interest in their work. Work ennobles, even the work of the hand. . . . The workman must proceed with his own development, and by his example and conduct influence his comrades; but the other classes of society must aid him in procuring means for his intellectual and moral development."

We are constrained to add, with Mr. Sidney Locock, "If the Dutch workman is below his foreign comrades in some respects, the holding of such opinions as these leads one to suspect that he deserves to rank equal with them in others." And we will venture to say, further, that whenever the working-classes of this country shall be found holding such opinions, "the other classes of society" will not be found antagonistic, but will only be too ready, so far as it shall lie in their power, to furnish "means for their intellectual and moral development."

We should be glad to think that this Blue-Book will be widely circulated and extensively read. From its reading we anticipate the happiest results. Some would doubtless be led to the conclusion that, as compared with their brethren in other countries, the lines have fallen to them in pleasant places; others again might be led to consider whether they might not with a better grace, and with some thankfulness, adjust themselves to their respective positions, instead of everlastingly stirring up strife and engendering widespread disaffection; while those bent on advancement in all that is good and true will receive herefrom a healthy stimulus. In a word, it contains just what the class most concerned in it most need at the present time, viz., full and reliable information, from which they may draw their own inferences and form their own conclusions and plans of action, which we are happy to think many among them are well able to do, unbiassed by the claptrap of interested, prejudiced, self-constituted leaders, whose ignorance is only equalled by their audacity.

S. M. B.

ART. VI.—MODERN SCEPTICISM.

Modern Scepticism. A Course of Lectures delivered at the request of the Christian Evidence Society. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

THE existence of the goodly volume we now introduce to the notice of our readers is calculated to awaken diversified feelings in the mind of a devout Christian. That there should be occasion for such a publication, especially at this advanced period in Christian history, is enough to make one sad. We should be far more jubilant to know that all men had faith than to hear of doubt and unbelief pervading all classes of society.

But it may be worth while, for a few moments, to look this alleged, and, we fear we must admit, this incontrovertible fact in the face, and try to get an intelligent conception of its character, and likewise a knowledge of the causes from which it springs. As its causes greatly determine its character we may look at them first. They are briefly adverted to by the Bishop of Gloucester in his explanatory paper appended to the Lectures contained in this volume. As he remarks, they are many and various, and probably defy any formal classification. As it is not his object to inquire fully into these causes, he only specifies those which illustrate the design of the lectures. The first cause he names stands connected with historical criticism. Since the time of Niebuhr a philosophical mode of treating ancient history has been adopted which was previously unknown. This method has been applied to sacred history, and to the various documents which together make up the Holy Bible. The spirit in which it has been done has sometimes been unexceptionable, at other times there has been wanting a due regard for the religious convictions of Christian readers. At any rate, this method of criticism must be "specified as one of the earlier causes of that suspended belief in the historical truth of several portions of the Old and New Testament, which many entertain at the present time, and make no scruple of avowing and justifying."

A second cause of much of modern scepticism is an overhasty generalization that has of late marked the rapid development of some of the natural sciences. The results thereby obtained, though imperfectly tested and verified, are put for-

ward with great confidence, and applied to damage the accuracy and veracity of the statements of Revelation.

Another cause is specified which, the Bishop thinks, involves in it much that will minister comfort and reassurance. There is going on amongst us an eager and often impatient search for solid ground whereon religion and morality may be based. "With all their faults," he says, "men are now certainly seeking for truth. There may be misapplications of historical criticism, there may be misuses and misapprehensions of the real testimony of science, but amid all there is clearly a searching for truth and firm ground."

Our readers from this will see what is the character of the scepticism dealt with in this volume. But is the scepticism arising from the causes adverted to the only scepticism existing amongst us? We fear not. Our Saviour's words are true of the present generation: "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." A depraved heart is undoubtedly the cause of much of our unbelief, and we confess we are not so comforted and reassured by the desire to touch ground which we are told is indicated even by embracing such a system as Positivism. Justly we are told that in that system "Science and scientific truth is used in a way that warrants the apprehension that—if such is to be the use made of it—the progress of science may tend, first, to impair, and, next, to obliterate, the sense of *responsibility* on which the present and the future alike so solemnly rest." It is also further admitted that "the tendencies of modern scientific investigations certainly do *appear* to hinder the due recognition of these two momentous principles—first, the sense of responsibility; and, secondly, the sense of dependence on something higher than law, order, and evolution." Our conviction is that these sentences indicate the source from which much of modern scepticism proceeds. It has a moral as well as an intellectual origin. We have it, therefore, in its malignant type existing among us, and in this form it sways not only a great number of our industrial population but educated portions of society likewise. The desire to get rid of the sense of responsibility, and especially of responsibility to a holy and righteous God, who will render to every man according to his works, accounts for much of the intellectual doubt and unbelief which are so distinctly traceable in all classes of society.

Still we thankfully acknowledge that a great deal of modern scepticism—perhaps a greater proportion than in any previous generation—is of a different sort altogether. It is not too

much to say that, in many instances, it is the temporary result of an effort to attain to an intelligent and perfectly assuring faith on the several topics concerned. Every individual who truly believes has passed through a phase of enquiry, and while in that stage of mental experience his mind has been no stranger to doubt. But one who has trod the path before, and, therefore, knows the natural history of all intelligent and abiding convictions, will not be dismayed to find his dearest friend, provided he is conscientious and earnest in his search after truth, for a time in Doubting Castle, or a passenger through the Slough of Despond. Still he will not be indifferent to him while in that condition, nor to the issue of his perplexities and misgivings, but will render all the service he can to deliver him from the Grip of Giant Despair, and get him through the Slough of Despond on the right side.

In this spirit, and for this object, we are happy to see that the labours recorded in this volume have been conceived and prosecuted; hence its existence gives us joy while the occasion of it tends to make us sad, and we cannot but regard its publication as an encouraging sign of the times. It is something new to deal with sceptics and scepticism as they are here dealt with. We quote with great satisfaction the following passage from the explanatory paper:—

"The lectures will be found to be marked throughout with learning, candour, and we believe also *with gentleness and sympathy*. On this last characteristic we ourselves lay great stress. If we would reclaim the wandering or confirm the wavering, it is not by harsh words and unkindly imputations, but by the expression of that love and gentleness which an Apostle reminds us are numbered among the fruits of the Spirit. We must regard ourselves as far as possible in their places, endeavour to see as they see, and feel as they feel, and then it may be given to us to return from our charitable quest bringing back the friendly wanderers with us, and ourselves sharing some portion of that holy joy which is felt in heaven and in earth when the doubter is led back to belief, and the lost is found."

A perusal of the lectures will show that the Bishop has not wrongly characterised them. They are marked by unmistakeable sincerity and earnestness on the part of the authors; they believe, and therefore they speak, but they are not less animated with a spirit of candour and love. We quote two passages in illustration of this:—

"There are, I will candidly confess, difficulties in the way of faith. However new may be the form of the attack, and however modern the materials which it uses, yet the strength of the attack lies in

real difficulties, which are no new matter, but have ever lain deep in the minds of thoughtful men. I do not believe that belief is a thing easy of attainment, any more than virtue is. I believe that both are victories gained by a struggle—gained over opposing forces. But as certain as I am that this present state of things was intended to train man to virtue, though I cannot answer all the objections brought against the system of the world being exactly what it is, nor solve all the doubts and difficulties—moral and metaphysical—which surround us; so I am convinced, in spite of similar difficulties in the way of religion, that belief, and not unbelief, is the end at which man ought to aim. I believe that man was intended to attain to a higher and more perfect state than that in which he now finds himself, and that he can only attain to it by virtue and faith; but as the very value of these lies apparently in their being won by an effort, long and earnestly maintained, I am not surprised at the existence of difficulties, least of all of such difficulties as arise from our ignorance."—pp 142-143.

The above quotation is from the lecture of the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Payne Smith, on Science and Revelation; we add to it the following from the lecture on The Gradual Development of Revelation, by the Bishop of Carlisle:—

"With the atheist, I honestly confess, that I have little or no sympathy; certainly I should not think it worth while to compose a lecture intended for his special behoof. I should feel disposed rather to send him for his answer to the fourteenth and fifty-third Psalms. The difficulty of supposing the framework of the universe to have had no architect appears to me to be so great, so absolutely immeasurable, that the man who can fancy that he has got over it must, as I believe, either not have understood the difficulty, or else have deceived himself as to his power of solving it; anyhow, I feel that he has cut away all ground of argument as between him and me. Not so the man whose mind is sceptically inclined. Be it ever remembered that the word *sceptic* is derived from a word which means to *look* or to *see*; it is the same word which forms the root of the word *bishop* or *overseer*, and accordingly there is nothing radically reproachful in the name of *sceptic*. It implies that a man is determined to look into matters for himself; not to trust every assertion, not to repeat a parrot creed; and so far as this determination is concerned, it is high and noble, and is in fact the very root and spring of all human knowledge; but who can wonder if looking should lead to doubting, and that the name of sceptic should popularly imply, not the man who looks and believes, but the man who looks and doubts? And I am not ashamed to confess that I have much sympathy with this sceptical frame of mind. Not only is it closely connected with a noble instinct of inquiry and search for truth which God has implanted in the human mind, but also, as I believe, it is well-nigh impossible that an inquiring mind should deal seriously

with religious subjects and remain entirely free from doubt. In my opinion the amount of scepticism which has, during some period of his life, occupied the mind of each thoughtful, earnest man, will be merely a question of degree; while at the same time I most sincerely believe that scepticism ought not to be, and need not be, the lasting condition of the human soul, and that all doubts may be made to vanish in the light which God has given to 'lighten every man who is born into the world.'"—pp. 261-263.

In this Christian temper, as far as we can see, all the lecturers have executed their tasks. The number of lectures contained in the volume is eleven; twelve were delivered, but one, by the desire of the writer, is withheld from publication. The series in its original design was a complete one, having reference first to the three systems—Materialism, Pantheism, and Positivism—which are now more especially coming into collision with Christianity; then to the chief difficulties arising from the supposed conflict between Science and the Holy Scriptures; then to the more special difficulties connected with the Holy Scriptures; the course concluding with two lectures, viz., one on "Christ's Teaching and Influence on the World," and one on the "Completeness and Adequacy of the Evidences of Christianity." The completeness of the series is somewhat impaired by the withholding of the lecture on the "Internal Evidence of the Authenticity of St. John's Gospel;" and the inability of the committee to procure a lecturer on the "additional strength which is brought to the evidences of Christianity by the convergence of various lines of independent testimony."

The contributors to this volume are the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Carlisle, Ely, and Gloucester, Dr. Rigg (Wesleyan), Dr. Stoughton (Congregationalist), the Rev. Canon Cooke, Canon of Exeter; the Rev. Stanley Leathes, Professor of Hebrew, King's College; the Rev. W. Jackson, late fellow of Worcester College, Oxford; the Rev. G. Rawlinson, Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford; and the Rev. C. Rowe, of Pembroke College, Oxford.

It is evident from this enumeration of names that if our country can supply scholars and divines competent to the work undertaken, the Committee of the Christian Evidence Society have found them. No one will probably read all the lectures with equal interest or with equal profit; that will be decided in a great measure by their adaptation to the intellectual or moral state of the reader. But on the whole we regard the volume as a valuable boon to the world, and every Christian may be thankful for such a contribution to the upholding of his faith in the domain of reason. That it will answer all

inquiries and silence all doubts, on the subjects treated upon, is not to be expected, but we shall be greatly surprised if it is not to many a perplexed and inquiring spirit a guide into clearer light, and to the comfort which comes from a more certain faith.

We think the Bishop of Gloucester has correctly pointed out an indirect benefit which may be expected to flow from the publication, which is not to be underrated. There is, as his lordship says, often a secret sympathy with the attacking party, not so much on the merits of the case as from the simple fact that it *is* the attacking party; and that while on this side there is only the passivity of prescription, on the other there is all the vigour of assault and progress. It is not, we trust, too much to hope that the publication of this volume may tend to stem, if it do not turn, the tide; or, as his lordship puts it, that this latent sympathy with the attack will be neutralized when it is found that the defence is not deficient in energy or vigour, and when English fair play seems to suggest that each side should be allowed to fight it out without having advantages arising from prepensions or prejudice. On this account the man of assured faith, who personally does not need the help here supplied, should hail with joy the service rendered to the cause of truth by the labours of the Christian Evidence Society.

We cannot dismiss the volume from our hands without reference to the catholic spirit in which this work of defence is undertaken. Let no one say, notwithstanding the bigotry and party spirit of which we too often have humiliating displays among those who believe in the same Christ, that the former days were better than these, when dignitaries of the Church of England and ministers of the Wesleyan and Congregational bodies can co-operate in an effort to present the Holy Scriptures in their most accurate form to the English reader, and also in their attempt to defend and maintain the truth as it is in Jesus Christ our Lord. "These things are of good augury." May all they prognosticate be speedily and abundantly realised!

J. HUDSTON.

Art. VII.—DR. COOKE'S SERMONS.

Dr. Cooke is well known as an eminent minister of the Methodist New Connexion. For more than twenty years he was editor of the magazines of that body, an office in which his intellectual characteristics and extensive learning appeared to advantage. As an author he has long been before the public, and his works in divinity, especially "The Deity: an argument for the existence and attributes and personal distinctions of the Godhead;" "Christian Theology;" and "The Shekinah," have been highly appreciated both within and beyond his own denomination. As a preacher also he has enjoyed an extended popularity. We presume, therefore, that our readers will welcome some observations relative to the character and aims of the publication before us.

As stated in the preface, "these discourses, for the most part, have been preached on special occasions." Some of them, we know, have been delivered in chapels thronged to the door with hearers, whose eager attention and high excitement showed how strongly the mind may be stirred by broad and powerful religious statements, aided by a vivacious and commanding delivery. The circumstances in which occasional sermons are often preached, the concourse swelling beyond the usual congregation, the expectation turned to the unfamiliar preacher, the concern felt that the pecuniary result of the service may not fall short of a certain standard—these and other common attendants of "special occasions," by heightening the tone of general feeling, are favourable to distinctness and depth of impression. The mind at such times is more susceptible than ordinary, the memory is more retentive, perhaps, also, the devout affections may be more easily excited and warmed. It is a pleasant thing, after an interval of years, to have the recollection revived of the effects produced upon us by sermons of excellence on such occasions, and, when opportunity is given, it must be interesting, and may well be profitable, to peruse the words which, as we heard them, charmed us with their beauty or thrilled us with their power, although, undoubtedly, the printed page will but poorly represent the sum of qualities that seemed to belong to the sermons when preached. We are glad to think that those who have repeatedly listened to Dr. Cooke on distinguished occasions, may hope to find, in the volume now published, not a little that will remind them of the best features of his ministry.

But the intrinsic merits of these discourses will give them value and acceptableness, without the help of association with the past. The first thing we notice is that the subjects discussed are great subjects, and that the discussion of them is calculated to awaken a sense of their greatness. Without underrating comparatively minor and unessential matters, the author gives deserved prominence to the main Christian verities, to the cardinal doctrines and leading duties of our religion. He deals with the highest and most sacred interests both of the individual and of humanity at large, and hence his utterances are fitted to move deeply the mind and heart. We would not confine ministers to a small variety and narrow range of topics. It rests upon them to declare "the whole counsel of God," keeping back nothing that is profitable. Revealed truth, in all its extent, and under every aspect, is the appointed subject of their ministrations. They cannot be always handling subjects of an animating and impulsive order; they must exhibit things of the utmost moment interchangeably with things of far inferior importance. To obviate objections, to elucidate difficulties, to enforce attention to particular branches of morals, are tasks which, with others of like nature requiring minute reference, come within their public duty not less truly than the work of general instruction, expostulation, and appeal. Still, themes of primary and universal interest should be the chief theme of addresses from the pulpit, and indeed the staple subjects of preaching they must be, if hearers are to be impelled to fix their attention on their everlasting concerns. The Christian ambassador who understands his office aright will eschew curious speculations, nice points of casuistry, controversial questions of little importance whichever way they may be settled, preferring to dwell on the fundamental truths of Christianity as those best suited to his purpose. Dr. Cooke has wisely chosen his subjects. Rowland Hill's three R's—"Ruin by the Fall," "Righteousness by Christ," "Redemption by the Spirit," are strikingly manifest throughout his sermons, and this, in our judgment, is one of their excellences.

We trust a time will come when Christian laymen, as well as ministers and ministerial students, will study the Bible with all the helps at their command, to find out what God has caused to be written for their learning, and to view the principles they may thus discover in their multiplied connections and bearings. Why should theology, the science of religion, the most august and glorious of all the sciences, be cultivated only by those who have an official interest in it? Educated

religious persons think it desirable to be able to form intelligent opinions, and to speak intelligently, on a variety of subjects which have little or nothing to do with their occupations in life. They study history, politics, natural science, the fine arts. Has theology no title to a place, an advanced place in their programme? We are sure well-informed Christians of every class would find careful and orderly theological reading of great personal service, whatever might be its influence in promoting their usefulness. We may mention particularly its preservative use. Never, probably, was there an age in which it behoved the disciples of our faith more than at the present day to prepare for the trial of their steadfastness, as well by labouring after clear, connected, and symmetrical views of revealed doctrine, as by cultivating those dispositions which fortify the heart against the approaches of error. In this view, these sermons are adapted to existing wants. To those who have neither opportunity nor inclination to study elaborate theological treatises, but yet may wish to gain some acquaintance with religion as a science, by a thoughtful reading of instructive sermons, this collection may be confidently recommended. No reader will be left in doubt as to the author's principles. Dr. Cooke has no dread of asserting the truths of Scripture with precision and boldness. He believes in dogmatic theology, and we mean no disparagement when we say this. For the teachers of antiquity who could publish only the deductions of unaided reason, the becoming tone was one of hesitancy and indistinctness. But now that the darkness is past, and the true light shineth, there is no reason why Christian teachers should speak of the certainties of the Gospel as if they were doubtful after all, but much reason why they should give them positive, unambiguous, and emphatic utterance.

The volume opens with a discourse on the Immortality and Eternity of Jehovah's Word. The text is, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24, 25.) It is a sermon full of broad conceptions, and written in a style of remarkable lucidity. The third part treats of the supernatural and miraculous element which enters so largely into the Scriptural narratives, and shows that God is not governed by, but that He governs, the economy of nature, that while moral laws are supreme and inviolable, physical laws are subordinate and mutable. This is illustrated with great fulness by instances taken from the inspired records.

The four following discourses, while containing a rich variety of matter, have a common object, their design being to vindicate

the divine requirement of faith. Faith is represented as one of the noblest exercises of our nature, and as needful to enlighten and expand the intellectual vision. Examples are given of its triumphs over all difficulties, and of the fulfilment of the Divine word under circumstances the most extraordinary. The close of the fifth sermon describes the attitude to be maintained by believers towards miracles, mysteries, and alleged contradictions between science and revelation. On the relations of Science and Scripture, which is, in some respects, the topic of the day, the following extract will be too conservative to suit the tastes of some:—

"It is not, indeed, the purpose of revelation to teach scientific, but religious truth. Yet in every instance when its teachings do involve some scientific fact they are undoubtedly just as true as any of its sacred doctrines, and we accept them as such. The facts alleged by some as contradictory to revelation may be divided into three classes. First, there are those which are no facts at all, but which further discoveries have proved to be fictions, once, indeed, firmly believed and confidently urged, but now disowned by a more correct and advanced science. Such are the nebular hypothesis, the creation of animalcula by chemical process, and the boasted antiquity of Egyptian and Chinese chronicles. Secondly, there are those alleged facts which are doubtful, and on which a cautious science declines to arbitrate with dogmatic authority, such as the age assigned to certain geological phenomena, and many alleged facts in physiology. Thirdly, there are certain alleged natural phenomena which may be true, or at least are incapable of disproof at present, yet the theories built upon them are false. Such are the theories which deny the unity of the human race, or which assert for man an antiquity of millions of years, or pretend to derive his existence from the baboon, or some inferior animal. When men propound such theories, they ought to support them by proof. Speculation and conjecture are good for nothing here."

It is admitted that there are difficulties, real difficulties, between science and revelation, and there may be even greater still. What then?

"We ought to be careful not to substitute our own erroneous interpretations, or our own preconceived notions for the testimony of Holy Scripture; we must be careful not to make the sacred writers accountable for what they do not teach. We must re-examine our opinions, and use all the aids of Biblical criticism. This is due to science, due to the Word of God, and due to the sacred cause of truth itself. But if, after all, there is still some unresolved or at present unresolvable difficulty, or apparent opposition, we must not disbelieve the Bible, nor fritter away its teachings, nor even suspend our faith

in its testimony. We must rather doubt the constancy of Nature and Nature's laws than doubt the truth of revelation. We must believe and wait."

We do not take upon ourselves to assert the conclusiveness of the reasoning of the sixth discourse on "The Existence and Glory of Christ before the Creation of the Universe." Of course, the argument is not intended to substitute or supersede the well-known arguments for our Lord's divinity, but only to give them supplemental strength. We give the author's own summary of the reasonings pursued:—

"The Scripture declares, and reason proves, that God has exercised the affection of love from all eternity. The same witnesses harmonize in their testimony that the exercise of love requires an object as well as an agent—that the object and agent cannot be numerically and personally the same—that the object must be a conscious and personal existence, and is declared in Scripture to be the Son of God—that the object of eternal love must Himself be of eternal existence and absolute excellence—that to be an adequate object of infinite love, He must possess infinite capacity—that if He possesses infinite capacity, He must possess every other attribute in infinite perfection—that if he possesses infinite attributes, He must possess an infinite nature—that if identical in nature and attributes with the Father he must reciprocate the love which He receives, and that this love joined with identity of nature and attributes, must be the foundation of the most intimate union and the most perfect and blessed communion. Such a being must be truly and properly God. Thus reason and Scripture concur in declaring the proper Deity of the Son of God."

When Dr. Cooke says that *reason proves* that God has *exercised* the affection of love from all eternity, we are compelled to withhold our assent. "If love," he argues, "be essential to God's existence, it follows that there never was a period in eternity when love was absent from Him. If He has existed from all eternity, He has loved from all eternity. Before there was a creation in existence to receive His love, His love was possessed and exercised." To test this reasoning, let us apply it to another Divine attribute—power. Every one who believes that God is, believes not merely that He is Almighty, but that Almightiness—the power that once created and now upholds all things—is essential to His existence. But "if" power "be essential to God's existence, it follows that there never was a period in eternity when" power "was absent from Him. If He has existed from all eternity, He has" exerted power "from all eternity. Before there was a creation in existence to receive his" power, "His power was possessed and exercised." Creative

and upholding power was possessed and exercised "before there was a creation in existence!" We confess our distrust of a mode of argument which, as it seems to us, leads irresistibly to such a conclusion. The doctrine of the Trinity, in all its parts and relations, is one of pure revelation, and should, we think, be treated accordingly. Those, however, who cannot admit the validity of Dr. Cooke's reasoning in this case, must recognise the ability with which it is conducted.

1 Tim., 3—16, is the basis of a discourse on "God Incarnate," &c. In regard to the disputed word in this verse, Dr. Cooke considers the evidence of manuscripts and versions as "preponderating" in favour of making the reading "God," and maintains that no other word can give any rational meaning to the text. Of the two meanings of the term "mystery," that of incomprehensibleness chiefly rules his remarks. We have never met with any one who thought it right to refuse revealed doctrines because of their mysteriousness, but many, no doubt, do reject them in consequence of this, and it is important that men's proneness to do so should be withstood.

The fifteenth sermon is on "The Duty of Christians Loving one Another," and is founded on John xiii., 34. Its eminently practical character will constitute its charm to those who feel that "love is the end of the commandment," "the fulfilling of the law." With most of it we entirely and heartily agree. We think, however, that there is considerable mistake on the question of Church union, and that bitter and repulsive sectarianism should be discriminated from catholic and peaceful denominationalism better than it is in what follows:—

"Is the condition of a church, rending itself into sectional divisions by splitting hairs of metaphysical distinction on non-essential points of doctrine, or on the mode of performing a ceremony, or on the theory of ecclesiastical discipline, consistent with the union represented by the unity of the persons in the Godhead? Should every variety of sentiment cause a division, and be represented by a distinct organization? Should there be any power to sever more mighty than the power that unites? Is there not sin somewhere when this is the case?"

Assuming that Christians may be distinguished, by conscientious differences, into Baptists and Pœdo-Baptists, into Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents, it seems to us very manifest that the order, harmony, and edification of the whole must be better secured by "sectional divisions," extending to one another loving and practical recognition, than it could be by a general coalescence of churches, supposing this were practicable. As Christianity advances to its final triumph

we expect that the internal condition of religious communities will undergo modifications in the direction of fuller and closer union; but we much mistake if believers will not continue to be grouped into "distinct organizations," according to their distinguished views and practices.

The eighteenth sermon is "An Exposition of the Second Psalm," and a glorious exposition it is, abounding in illustrative facts drawn from all periods of history. Literary judgment is finely displayed in every part of this harmonious composition. The following extract, setting forth that retribution, sooner or later, follows the presumptuous opposition of Christ's enemies, will enable the reader to judge of the style:—

"Where is Egypt, one of the earliest heathen nations visited by God's ambassadors, and one of the first to utter the haughty challenge—'Who is the Lord, that I should serve him?' Where is Egypt now, and what her condition for twenty centuries? Let Karnac and Luxor, and Thebes and Memphis, and other ruined cities strewn over that desolate land, testify! Those colossal ruins which everywhere fill the traveller with wonder are the monuments of her fallen greatness, and of the vengeance that struck her down and dashed her 'in pieces like a potter's vessel.' Where are ancient Babylon and Nineveh, those famous cities so populous and gay, so magnificent and powerful; and favoured, too, with the visits of prophetic messengers, —where are those cities now? Silent and desolate, reduced to huge heaps of ruin where now the jackal hideth, and the scorpion creepeth, and the screech-owl uttereth nightly her dismal wail—dashed 'in pieces like a potter's vessel.' Where is the Jewish nation which first crucified the Son of God as a malefactor, and then rejected the mercy procured by His atoning blood, and murdered the ambassadors of His grace? Their country is desolate, their city trodden down by the Gentiles, the Mosque of Omar stands mockingly where once the temple stood, and the Jews themselves as a people are scattered among all nations, bearing the mark of God's displeasure for their rejection of His Son—dashed to 'pieces like a potter's vessel!' Where is the mighty empire of Rome, once flourishing in unrivalled power and grandeur, but deeply stained with martyr's blood? She has fallen: the little stone cut from the mountain without hands hath smitten her! hath broken her to pieces like a potter's vessel, and the fragments of her fallen greatness are scattered over the civilized world! Where now those royal servitors and abettors of the Man of Sin, who once occupied the thrones of Spain, Italy, and France. One by one they have been ignominiously driven from their thrones! These are impressive illustrations of the principle and the prophecy so forcibly expressed in this psalm. Nor is the prophecy yet exhausted. There are yet other opponents to be put down; there are yet other vials of wrath to be poured out; and the work of judgment will go on until every enemy be vanquished or destroyed.

God will allow no power to stand in opposition to His Son. Persecuting rulers and their kingdoms, popes and all who uphold their blasphemous pretensions, persecuting magnates and their followers, civil or ecclesiastic, must either submit to His sceptre or be destroyed in His vengeance. 'For the nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish;' and if rebellious nations and kingdoms perish, how shall individual sinners escape who neglect the great salvation? Impossible! Though hand join in hand the wicked shall not go unpunished. 'Because there is wrath, beware lest He take thee away with His stroke: then a great ransom cannot deliver thee.'"

The subject of the last of these discourses is "Christ's Universal Reign." For unity of design, for excellence of arrangement, for strength and beauty of expression, and for passages of energy and eloquence, it is equal to any in this volume, and has few superiors anywhere. A note prefixed to it informs us that it was the first discourse published by the author—an interesting fact.*

The titles of the sermons we have left unnoticed are: "The Sacrificial Character and Mediatorial Glory of Christ"—"The Holy Spirit and His Diversified Operations"—"Man Created in God's Image"—"The Jailer's Conversion"—"Heirs of God"—"Believers the Temple of God"—"Supreme love to God"—"Importance and Blessedness of Saving one Soul"—"On Glorifying God."

In structure and style these sermons are not of the order that are at present most popular. Their attributes of nobility will insure their acceptance with a large body of readers: more freedom, more flexibility, more warmth and pathos would have commended them to a wider circle. They are not directly persuasive or conscience-searching in any considerable measure. The manner is sometimes argumentative and sometimes declamatory or rhetorical, but the style of direct pointed address is rarely employed. Although there is always unclouded clearness of expression, occasionally language simpler and less imposing would be more in place; the preacher seems now and then to wind himself higher than is needful. But if these are real defects, they stand in contrast to an assemblage of the highest qualities. It is impossible to read them without feeling that they deserve to be produced in this permanent form, and that they will abundantly justify the reputation which the author has for many years enjoyed. Dr. Cooke has done the Church an important service by this publication. We cannot doubt that it is destined, as it is adapted, to fulfil his expressed supreme desire "to establish God's people in the faith, to promote sound doctrine, and a healthy, earnest, and benevolent Christianity." T. D. CROTHERS.

* It was preached in Guernsey in 1836.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Biblical Museum; A collection of notes Explanatory, Homiletic, and Illustrative, on the Holy Scriptures, especially designed for the use of ministers, Bible students, and Sunday school teachers. By JAMES COMPER GRAY. Vol. I. Gospels of Matthew and Mark. Elliot Stock, 1871.

THE title of this work clearly states the character of the notes of which it is composed. Students and ministers may advantageously consult these notes, but to Sunday school teachers they will be a very valuable boon, as by their aid it will be the teacher's fault if his teaching does not in a great measure prove both interesting and instructive. Were we the manager of a Sunday school we would do our best to put a copy of this work in the hands of every teacher, and also advise them always to have it by their side for reference when teaching their class. The anecdotes and illustrative quotations from standard authors would help greatly in the elucidation and enforcement of Scriptural truth, and give the opportunity of making a personal application of it to the scholars which, under God's blessing, would probably result in their early commencement of a truly religious life. How suggestive of explanatory remark and pointed appeal to the heart, for instance, is the anecdote given under the heading, *Simple Faith.* A poor little German boy who desired admission to the Moravian school, wrote a letter, and put it into the post-office, addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ in heaven. It ran about thus:—"My Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, I have lost my father. We are very poor; but I know that Thou tellest me in Thy Word that whatsoever we shall ask God in Thy name He will give it to us. I believe what Thou sayest, Lord Jesus. I pray, then, unto God in the name of Jesus, that He will give my mother the means of placing me in the Moravian school; I should like so much to continue to be taught! I pray unto Thee already, but I will love Thee still more." The post-master, seeing the strange address, opened the letter. It was read at a meeting of the Moravian Society, when the Baroness de la Leppe became his patroness, and sent him to the school he desired.

The Fool's Gospel. Elliot Stock, 1871.

THE title of this work is suggested by a well-known passage in the

thirty-fifth of Isaiah: "And a way shall be there, and it shall be called, The way of holiness. The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." We confess to a strong dislike to these quaint and conceited titles; they never attract us to the books to which they are given, but otherwise. A good book with a silly title may, on account of its designation, gain a few readers, who but for it would never have turned over its pages, but they will be of a class which will receive very little benefit by the exercise; while the earnest-minded and intelligent, those who read to be made wiser and better, will be repelled from it, or peruse it with distrust and dissatisfaction, because of the vanity or unwisdom of the author in choosing its name.

The little volume lying before us might have had a more appropriate title than that it bears. It is an attempt to give a rational view of the Gospel; to present the Gospel to man in such a way that his reason shall at once acquiesce in it. In doing this a different version is given of it from that we are accustomed to receive from an evangelical pulpit. In many points this Fool's Gospel is simply mild Unitarianism. Take one sentence—"Sacrifice is not necessarily 'suffering;' it is 'offering;' and implies therefore a *willingness* to suffer. It is devotedness." This sentence is the commencement of a chapter filled with illustrations to show that the sacrifice of Christ was His devotedness to the good of others, even to dying for them if that should come in His way of doing them good. The first and leading illustration is that of a life-boat crew going to rescue the shipwrecked at the risk of losing their own lives, and after representing Jesus as saying to men that He would withhold nothing from them, not even life, if need be, the author exclaims,—"This was an offering indeed, a sacrifice, the greatness of which never has been, and never will be, computed; and like that of the life-boat crew, the offering, which is the very life and essence of sacrifice, was perfect, even though suffering had never followed." If this is the fool's gospel it is not, we sincerely believe, the gospel of the Jewish prophets when they testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow; or of the Christian apostles when they proclaimed that He, the Just, suffered for us the unjust, that He might bring us to God.

But while on many points we consider the teachings of this book both defective and erroneous, we do not advise that it should be altogether discarded. We are so prone to one-sidedness on theological questions, that it is well to be reminded there is another side than that we are ever contemplating, and with discrimination we may peruse this book with advantage. The preacher may learn from it to put

the things most fully believed among us with greater clearness and effect.

The Gospel Church, delineated from the New Testament, in its constitution, worship, order, ministers, and ministrations. An exhibition in detail of the special privileges and authorized duties of Christian fellowship. By HENRY WEBB. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1871.

THIS will be voted by many to be a dull book, and perhaps but few of its readers will see eye to eye with the writer on all the questions considered; but it may be a useful book for all that, and well worthy of a careful perusal. A reader who values a book simply because it is the reflection of his own views is not likely to attain to much enlargement of mind. At some future period we shall, if opportunity offers, give Mr. Webb's work a lengthened notice.

Missionary Enterprise no Fiction. A tale founded on facts. Elliot Stock, 1871.

IF the style and language of this book had been more simple they would have been more to our taste. The aim of the writer, however, is very praiseworthy, and religious youth will read the work with interest, and by its descriptions have their thankfulness for their own advantages awakened, as also their sympathies evoked for those who are yet sitting in darkness and the shadow of death.

Commentary on the New Testament. By JAMES MORISON, D.D. Part XVIII. Gospel of Mark. Hamilton, Adams, and Co., 1871.

THIS part—the 6th since Matthew's gospel was completed—carries us to the 13th chapter of Mark. The learned doctor is not proceeding with the Commentary so rapidily as when its publication was first commenced; we see the next part is announced to be issued in March. Those most anxious to see it, however, would prefer this slowness of publication to any diminution of excellence. We most earnestly pray that the author's life may be spared to complete the whole of the New Testament, to the last chapter, and the last verse in Revelation.

The Class Leader's Assistant and Christian's Hand-Book. Containing nearly 500 views of Christian doctrine, duty, experience, and practice, arranged for ready reference. With copious index. By JOHN BATE.

THIS new and revised edition of an excellent work by a Wesleyan minister, is being issued in twelve parts, twopence each. The seventh is already out. If leaders could give an hour to its perusal before they went to meet their class for religious fellowship and counsel, we have no doubt that those services, which are said to be falling into sad neglect among Methodists, would partake of a character that would lead oftener to the exclamation on the part of members, "I have been there, and still will go, 'tis like a little heaven below."

The Sunday Afternoon. Fifty-two brief Sermons. By J. BALDWIN BROWN, B.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THE title of the volume before us indicates the time for which it is intended, we apprehend, and not that on which its subject-matter was delivered. One can scarcely fancy Mr. Brown spending his strength on afternoon services, so long as the other parts of the sacred day are available for Divine worship. The major part of these brief sermons we have read with very great pleasure, and not a little profit, and deem them equally worthy of a place on our shelves with some which, coming from other sources, have elicited from the press a perfect chorus of praise. They are admirably adapted, too, to the end for which they are designed. Short, plain, eminently practical, and suggestive rather than exhaustive, they nevertheless have beauty as well as strength. Few men know better than our author how manifold and how real are the troubles which crush men's spirits and burden their lives, and few know better how to speak to these weary and heavy-laden ones the comfortable words and kind they so much need. Witness the concluding sentences of the sermon entitled "*De Profundis Clamavi*":—

"'Watchman, what of the night?' The night is far spent, the day is at hand; the golden flush is already stealing up in the eastern sky. Cease thy moan, faint heart; tune thy lips to praise. Night passes; day is eternal. Darkness is of the moment; sunlight is endless. If the darkness oppress thee, if there is no light, brace thy limbs to climb. Nay! hast thou no strength? Do thy limbs refuse to bear thee? Then take the wings of faith and soar. See beyond the sullen tempest and the moaning sea a band of golden light in the far distance. The sun is shining there with cloudless splendour on a land fairer than a poet's dreams. A sure pilot steers thy storm-tossed vessel through the billows. He will not leave the helm till He has landed thee on that blessed shore."

We are occasionally reminded of the author's "Misread Passages of Scripture" (two little volumes, by the way, which ought to be in the hands of every Bible student), as for instance in the following :—

"'*Ephraim is joined to his idols, let him alone.*' Why? Surely in the hope that, discovering what their idols can do for them, they may return unto their God, and say, '*Hitherto other lords beside Thee have had dominion over us, but henceforth by Thee only will we make mention of Thy name.*' Our first thought in reading such a passage as that in Jeremiah xiv., 11, in which the prophet is forbidden even to pray for the reprobate people, would be, that the hour of final and utter rejection had come. 'They have made their final choice, let them take henceforth their own course. I have done with them for ever.' In the last discourse I passed a long series of ages in rapid review, that you might see how little this can be the fundamental meaning of the passage. But lest we should be in doubt about it, the prophet, in God's name, expounds to us God's method, which history also amply reveals. '*I will go and return to my place till they acknowledge their offence and seek my face : in their affliction they will seek me early.*'

"Nothing can explain more explicitly what God means by letting a people alone. Let their gods rule them, shield them, save them; and let them learn by experience what such salvation is worth. Let them pine with hunger, let them faint with toil, let them be lost in the wilderness, let them be in terror in the night, not that I may be avenged on them, and triumph in the contemplation of the wretchedness of which in vain I warned them, but that in their hunger and pain the memory of their Father's house many rise within them with winning beauty and freshness, and that their hearts, long lonely and desolate, may pine again for the embrace of a Father's love."

There are, beside, manifold germs of thought which, unlike many concretions of words which pass by that name, can scarcely fail to germinate in the minds of those who can think. But recently, we remember, Mr. Brown expressed a fear lest he should publish too much, but so long as he can set forth the truths of the Gospel with the force and freshness of the present volume he need have no fear.

Aids to Daily Meditation: Being Practical Reflections and Observations on a Passage of Scripture for Each Day in the Year. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1871.

If people are not devotional they ought to be: that they are not certainly cannot result from any dearth of "aids," for they are numerous enough in all conscience; though whether all that arrogate to themselves the name are such in reality, we do not pretend to say. The one before us fairly answers to its title, and provided it is not allowed to supersede the one Book which for devotional purposes must ever stand alone, and from which all others must needs draw their inspiration, it is calculated to be highly useful. To the many to whom some such "aids" seem needful we can cordially recommend

it as the product of an intelligent piety, and as being free from the Calvinism and sickly sentiment too often found in works of its class. Altogether it supplies a desideratum, is well got up, and is cheap withal.

The Saviour's Parting Prayer for His Disciples: A series of chapters on our Lord's Intercessory Prayer. By the REV. W. LANDELS, D.D. Stock. 1872.

DR. LANDELS here deals with one of the most precious portions of the Word of God, a portion in which the Saviour more fully reveals Himself to His people than in any other. A feeling of awe steals over the devout Christian's mind as he considers this prayer, but not awe alone. He is drawn by it toward his Divine Lord with holy confidence and love, and there comes to his heart a peace which passes understanding as His "secret" is disclosed to him.

Those acquainted with the previous works of Dr. Landels will be able correctly to anticipate the character of this. Its several chapters are like so many fields of spiritual pasture wherein those who hunger and thirst after righteousness can feed on the richest nutriment. It is essentially a book for believers—for the spiritually minded,—and they will find it sweet to their taste. A lover of the Saviour cannot but read it with avidity and joy.

Silver Spray, and other Sketches from Modern Church Life. London: Stock. 1872.

A VERY good book in its line. Though relating mostly to Church life among the Congregationalists or Baptists, yet Methodists might read it with advantage. Its object is to breathe into Church life an honourable, generous, and tender spirit. In doing this it deals faithfully with many of the follies and inconsistencies too frequently displayed by professing Christians in relation to their church and minister, yet the tone is healthy if the censure be severe. We should like to know that it was generally read.

Labourers together with God: Words of Encouragement, Counsel, and Help for Sunday School Teachers. By the REV. G. CALTHROP, M.A. Stock. 1871.

THE object chiefly aimed at in this little work, the author tells us, is the *encouragement* of the Sunday School teacher. We should think

it cannot fail of answering its end with all who give it a careful perusal. And certainly a faithful teacher must often need encouragement, for he meets with many things to dishearten him. We hold, also, that nothing enfeebles more than discouragement. To be kept from its paralysing influence a teacher may advantageously make himself acquainted with the contents of Mr. Calthrop's little manual.

The Father of our Missions: being the Story of the Life and Labours of the Rev. Thomas Coke, D.C.L. With a brief Sketch of the Early History of Wesleyan Missions in various parts of the world, for Juvenile Readers. By the Rev. W. Moister. Stock. 1871.

It was a happy idea to write for children and the young generally a life of the founder of Wesleyan Missions. Mr. Moister has executed his task in a commendable way, and we hope the little book will have a wide circulation in our Sunday Schools and families.

The New Cyclopædia of Illustrative Anecdote. To be completed in Twelve Parts. Sixpence each. Stock. 1872.

This Cyclopædia is announced to contain a vast collection of authentic anecdotes, old and new, on a wide range of subjects, classified and arranged for ready reference, and designed for ministers, teachers, and the family circle. If Part I. may be taken as a fair specimen of succeeding numbers, this will be one of the best collections of anecdotes we possess. And who does not, with Dr. Johnson, love anecdotes? Good anecdotes are excellent teachers, and they help us excellently in teaching. We cannot but think this collection will be a popular book.

The Missionary World: An Encyclopædia of Information, Facts, Incidents, Statistics, Sketches, Anecdotes, etc., relative to Christian Missions. Stock. 1872.

Another of Mr. Stock's excellent serials, and which we hope will have a wide circulation. It is to be completed in Twelve Parts, fourpence each.

The Hive: A Storehouse of Material for Working Sunday School Teachers. Vol. 4. 1871. Stock.

We have already expressed our favourable opinion of former

volumes of this periodical, and as far as we can see this has equal excellence to its predecessors. Such a publication must be very helpful to working teachers.

Starting in Life; or, Familiar Talks with Young People. By JOHN CLIFFORD, M.A. London: Stock, 1872.

MOST cordially we give this little book a word of commendation. It is admirably adapted to interest and instruct those for whose use it has been written, namely, "Young people whose ages range from eleven to fourteen." A life commenced and prosecuted under the guidance of such principles and habits as are here inculcated cannot fail to be one of usefulness and honour—a truly Christian life.

The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley. By the REV. L. TYERMAN. Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.

A SECOND edition of this excellent memoir is now being published, to be completed in twelve half-crown parts. In this edition the author gives as far as possible the latest Methodist statistics. He also tells us he has carefully revised the whole work, giving one or two new facts. The portraits in the first edition were photographs, in this they are engravings; one being from an exceedingly scarce engraving published in 1743. It was the first portrait of himself which Mr. Wesley published, and formed the frontispiece to the first edition of his Notes on the New Testament. Among Methodists this biography ought to be an honourable book.

The Person of Christ. A Discourse delivered at Manchester, July 25th, 1871, in connection with the assembling of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, being the second Lecture on the foundation of John Fernley, Esq. With the History of the Doctrine of Christ's Person, and Notes. By the REV. W. B. POPE, Tutor in Theology, Didsbury College. Wesleyan Conference Office. 1871.

WE reserve this work for extended notice in our next number. In

the meantime we must say, it is an able contribution to orthodox theology; perhaps the most able ever furnished by Methodist pen.

The Friendly Visitor, 1871. Partridge and Co., London.

THIS is one of the number of admirable periodicals published by the Messrs. Partridge, and is well worthy of a place among its excellent companions. The reading and the illustrations are alike good, the names of the artists, Gilbert, Weir, &c., being a sufficient voucher for the latter. Those who wish well to society cannot do better than promote the circulation of such publications among the classes for which they are appropriate.

The Sword and the Shield: a reply to "The Sling and the Stone," by the Rev. C. Voysey, M.A. By THEOPHILUS. Part I.—Introduction. Stock, 1871.

WHY this introduction of twenty-two pages should be published apart from the work to which it seems intended to be affixed we cannot understand. The writer meets Mr. Voysey on his own ground of plain common sense, ordinary reason, and the well known principles of common morality, and as far as he goes successfully confutes the notion that Mr. Voysey advocates, viz., that *all* are being *now* educated and prepared for the realms of purity and bliss beyond the grave, and that therefore all will be ultimately happy.

A History of the Corruptions of Christianity. By JOSEPH PRIESTLY, LL.D. British and Foreign Unitarian Association. London, 1871.

A readable reprint for half-a-crown of a book that is too well known to need characterising.

Spiritualism Answered by Science. By EDWARD W. COX. Longman and Co., 1871.

THIS work is written to show that "the Power dignified by the title of Spiritual, because attributed to the presence and action of spirits of the dead, is in fact a Psychic Force proceeding from the human

intelligence." The subject is an exceedingly interesting one, but with what result it is here discussed the reader must judge for himself.

The Followers of the Nazarene; or, the Early Christians in Rome. By E. J. BODEN. Stock, 1872.

THIS is a pamphlet of thirty-two pages, in which the writer seeks to give a life-like picture of the social and religious life of Christians in the first century. Young persons will read the book with interest, and find incidents of which they may now have vague conceptions set before them in the glow and colour of reality.

The Youth's English Grammar, for use in junior classes: an introduction to the "Young Student's English Grammar." By DR. BULLOCK. Manchester: John Heywood, Deansgate.

Questions in "Modern History," adapted to Bullock's "History of Modern Europe," and as Elementary Composition Lessons. By DR. BULLOCK. Manchester: John Heywood, Deansgate.

Queer Folk: A Lecture delivered in the Methodist New Connexion Chapel, Southport, Jan. 2nd, 1872. By DR. BULLOCK. Manchester: John Heywood, Deansgate.

THE little work first named above is well nigh the simplest, most intelligible, and most effective that could be desired for the purpose intended. By its use "junior classes" will be pleasantly introduced into the generally dry details of English Grammar; while the labours of their tutors will be proportionately lighter and more fruitful. We can confidently recommend this manual.

Dr. Bullock's "History of Modern Europe" we pronounced in our last issue to be an excellent publication, perhaps the best that has appeared for the use of schools. The "Questions" he has now prepared are admirably adapted to utilise that work. In their conception and arrangement the chief topics of the "History" have been included in such a manner that the student of ordinary intelligence will, in using them, be able to store up as much information as could be obtained by wading through large volumes. When a few slips of composition and printing have been corrected in a second edition,

this work will be about perfect. The young people of our time owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Bullock for his great services on their behalf, a debt which is fast accumulating, for he seems to delight in multiplying the services. His educational and historical works have a deservedly high place in public estimation.

In "Queer Folk" Dr. Bullock claims our notice as a popular lecturer and a censor of the foibles of humanity. We can give him a fair measure of praise in both these capacities. If our readers will buy "Queer Folk," it is not likely that they will fail to find in some page of it a mirror in which their own "queernesses" will be more or less faithfully reflected; and we will hope that in their case at least it will be necessary only to look in order to avoid and amend. Should any one suppose himself to be without "queernesses" at all, he will stand convicted of being the *chief* of the "Queer Folk," and we commend him to Dr. Bullock as a fit subject for his next lecture.

Are we better than our Fathers? or a comparative view of the Social Position of England at the Revolution of 1688, *and at the present time.* Four Lectures delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral, November, 1871. By ROBERT GREGORY, M.A., Canon of St. Paul's. Oxford and London: James Parker, and Co., 1872.

IT was a bold and commendable idea of Canon Gregory to deliver a course of lectures to young men in the Metropolitan Cathedral on an important social topic like that selected. He says that his object was "to point to the existence of deep disorder in our social system." For carrying out this plan he has been charged by a portion of the press (probably the same that objected to the appointment of the Thanksgiving-day during Lent), "with delivering a series of lectures under the dome upon topics utterly foreign and inconsistent with those objects for which alone the Metropolitan Cathedral was first consecrated, and to which it has ever since been exclusively devoted." His reply is the publication of the lectures. If there be anything really inconsistent with the dignity of a cathedral for a preacher to discourse within its walls on matters affecting the best interests of humanity, though theological phrases be not employed, then we say the more shame on that system which creates such an inconsistency. The contents of this very readable and useful book are—Lecture I. Introduction—Are we better than our Fathers?—II. Distribution

of Wealth.—III. Relations of Labour and Capital.—IV. Pauperism. We are far from accepting all Canon Gregory's positions and conclusions, but we admire the spirit in which he has done his work, and urge our readers to study what he says on topics that just now are warmly discussed, and will come, by and by, more to the front, with a demand for a prompt and satisfactory settlement.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

We have thought that it would not be an unwelcome service in behalf of our readers to prepare a list of some of the principal books in various departments of literature which have lately issued from the press, appending to each as far as possible the name of the publisher, and the price. The following summary will be found to contain many works of a standard character:—

The Christ for all the Ages. By D. C. Davies. 5s. (Hodder and Stoughton).
Brightwell's Memorial Chapters in the lives of Christian Gentlewomen. 2s.
Bishop Temple's Sermons, 3rd series, 6s. (Macmillan).
Life and Labours of the Rev. J. Coke. 1s. 6d.
Cassell's History of the War, 1870-71. Vol. I. 9s.
Thoughts upon Government. By Arthur Helps. 9s. 6d. (Bell and Daldy).
The Divine Tragedy. By H. W. Longfellow. (Routledge).
Crumbs Swept up. By T. De Witt Talmage (Hodder & Stoughton).
Colenso's Pentateuch Critically Examined. Part VI. 24s. (Longmans).
Delitzch's Commentary on the Psalms. Vol. III. 10s. 6d. (Clarkes).
Hengstenberg's History of the Kingdom of God. Vol. I. 10s. (Clarkes).
John Forster's Life of Charles Dickens. Vol. I. 1812—1842. 12s. (Chapman and Hall).
Howson and Rimmer's Chester as it was. 14s.
Works of Lactantius. 2 Vols. 21s.
Blunt's Key to the Knowledge of Modern Church History. 2s. 6d.
The Desert of the Exodus. By E. H. Palmer, M.A. 2 Vols. 28s. (Bell and Daldy).
Middlemarch. By George Eliot. Books I. and II. (Blackwood).
Christ in Modern Life. By Rev. S. A. Brooke, M.A. 9s. 6d. (King and Co.)
Nazareth: its Life and Lessons. 5s. (King and Co.)
The Genesis of the Church. By Bishop Cotterill. 16s. (Blackwoods).
Frewen's Grounds and Principles of the Christian Religion 7s. 6d.
Galloway's Physical Facts and Scriptural Record. 10s. 6d. (Rivingtons).
Secular Annotations of Scripture Texts. By F. Jacox (Hodder and Stoughton).

Atmore's Methodist Memorial. 3s. 6d.
Boston Lectures, 1870-71, Christianity and Scepticism. 2 Vols. 8s. 6d. each.
Fifty Portraits of Philanthropic and Religious Celebrities. 7s. 6d.
Stevenson's Methodist Hymn Book and its Associations. 3s. 6d.
Morris's Earthly Paradise. Popular edition. Part I. 3s. 6d
Carlyle's Works. People's edition. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 4. 2s. each. (Chapman and Hall).
Rev. E. Burgess's What is Truth? 7s. 6d.
Rev. E. A. Abbott's How to Write Clearly. 1s. 6d.
Yonge's Three Centuries of English Literature. 7s. 6d.
The Switzers. By W. H. Dixon. 15s. (Hurst and Blackett).
Cobden Club Essays. 2nd series. 1871-2. (Cassells).
Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism. By the Duke of Somerset. 5s. (Bain).
Hammond's Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament. 3s. 6d.
Lange's Life of Christ. 4 Vols. 28s.
Rev. S. Hayman's "Looking upward." 5s.
Legends of Old Testament Characters, from the Talmud and other sources. By the Rev. T. Baring-Gould. 16s. (Macmillan).
Egypt of the Paraoahs and the Kedivé. By F. Barham Zincke. (Smith, Elder, and Co.)
Christ and His Seed, Central to all things. By J. Pulsford. 8s. 6d.
Canon Gregory's Are we better than our Fathers? 2s. 6d. (Parker).
Moses and Modern Science. By Jas. Elliott. 3s. (Hodder and Stoughton).
Christ the Consoler. Preface by Bishop of Carlisle. 6s.
J. Coombs's Thoughts for the Inner Life. 3s. 6d.
Tales of the Warrior Judges: a Sunday Book for Boys. 2s. 6d.
The Expressive Reading of the Sacred Scriptures, as promoted by emphasised translation, according to the logical idiom of the inspired original. By J. B. Rotherham. 6d. (Bagsters).

It may interest our readers to have a classified return of all the works published in England during the year 1871 :—

ANALYTICAL TABLE OF BOOKS (INCLUDING NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, AND AMERICAN IMPORTATIONS), PUBLISHED IN 1871.

Theology, Sermons, Biblical, &c.	768
Educational and Classical	661
Juvenile Works and Tales	716
Novels and other Works of Fiction	332
Law, Jurisprudence, &c.	141
Political and Social Economy, Trade and Commerce	157

Arts, Science, and finely Illustrated Works	319
Travel and Geographical Research	233
History and Biography	325
Poetry and the Drama	325
Year Books and bound Volumes of Serials	385
Medicine and Surgery	173
Belles Lettres, Essays, Monographs, &c.	308
Miscellaneous, including Pamphlets, not Sermons	309
Total	5,157

SUMMARY FOR EACH MONTH.

	New Books.	New Editions.	American Importations.
January	275	76	48
February	215	89	21
March	304	121	28
April	308	97	29
May	284	123	2
June	274	90	28
July	221	95	40
August	240	75	23
September	174	114	25
October	263	86	38
November	476	172	40
December	513	150	—
	3,547	1,288	322

Making the total during the twelve months, new publications 5,157.

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY.

JUNE, 1872.

ART. I.—THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

PART II.

IN our last article on the Resurrection of the Dead (*Meth. Quar.* for June, 1871), we somewhat abruptly, on account of length, closed our remarks. There were some possible objections to the view we expounded deserving our attention, the consideration of which we were thus obliged to postpone. We now take the opportunity of calling attention to them.

The postponement has been attended with one advantage. Opportunity for criticism of the article has been afforded. Several friends have kindly availed themselves of it, not without considerable benefit to the writer, and to whom therefore he gladly acknowledges his indebtedness. We have been helped to some extent in the composition of this article by their kindly criticisms; but as they were private we can refer to them in a general way only. We are aware that we have also been publicly criticised; but they who publish their opinions cannot expect to be exempt from public criticism. This article, however, substantially meets both public and private objections.

In the opening sentences of our first article are these words: "So far as theology is concerned, this is a transitional age." We wrote this sentence elliptically. Supplying the ellipsis, it would read thus: "So far as the attitude of the minds of men not strictly orthodox in relation to theology is concerned, this is a transitional age." It may be asked, What are the two points *ab quo ad quem*? Our next sentence indicated them, —"Reason is in apparent conflict with faith." Till reason—the reasoning mind—can joyfully accept and join hands with faith in matters theological, there is no firm standing ground—no abiding satisfaction—for such men. They carry with them

the elements of unrest, and if they do not speedily harmonize, by some means, reason and faith, they will either be hurled back on undisguised rationalism, or forward into the dank undergrowths of superstition. The *ab quo* is reason in conflict with faith, with a tendency to the ultimate rejection of faith; the *ad quem* is reason in harmony with faith—"reason being satisfied that faith is reasonable,"—each knowing the other's place and power, and content to know it.

It will be well, before proceeding to answer objections, to state the various views held on this subject, and wherein we agree or differ from them. The current theory is, that the actual body laid in the grave, or that the actual particles composing our present body, or so many of them as would be necessary for the purpose, are essential to the resurrection of the dead. Bishop Stillingfleet, Archbishop Tillotson, Mr. Cochrane, as we saw in our previous article, and others, held this view and defended it; and, indeed, the general impression—we can hardly call it conviction—is that this is the correct view. Dr. Watts, in his Philosophical Essays, after stating the arguments which may be urged for and against the resurrection of the same individual body laid in the grave, proceeds to show how a compromise may be effected, the gist of which is, that we may allow so many of the particles "may go to constitute the new-raised body, as justly to denominate it the same body, and which, being united to the same soul, do render the new-raised man the same man and the same person who died." He then states that, in all probability, there are in the human body "some original, essential, and constituent tubes, fibres, or staminal particles," which remain the same through all the changes of the body, and that these are quite sufficient to constitute us the same persons throughout life and at the resurrection. This is the "germ" theory of the Resurrection. It is an old rabbinical doctrine; and was advocated by Samuel Drew, and is still held by a few.

Speaking in our first article of the reasonings by which these theories have been supported, we ventured to call them "eccentric," and so far as such views constituted a theology, we denominated such theology "satiric." A correspondent thinks this language too severe, as going beyond the intentions of those who held the above theories;—that their reasonings ought not to be called eccentric, nor their theology satiric until it is determined whether matter is *molecule* or *force*. We incline to think our epithets were unduly severe; but, in justice, we must say we referred to the theories only, not to those who propounded them. Personally, we give

them not only respect but reverence, on many accounts. To those, however, who hold views which differ from theirs somewhat, their reasonings sometimes appear ludicrous. Thus Mr. Noble, a Swedenborgian, whose theory of the Resurrection our previous article, in spirit, decidedly opposed, quotes a solemn description of the resurrection from Dr. Young's poem, *The Last Day*, as follows:—

"'Now monuments prove faithful to their trust,
And render back their long committed dust:
Now charnels rattle; scattered limbs, and all
The various bones, obsequious to the call,
Self-moved, advance; the neck, perhaps, to meet
The distant head; the distant legs, the feet.
Dreadful to view, see through the dusty sky
Fragments of bodies in confusion fly,
To distant regions journeying, there to claim
Deserted members, and complete the frame.'

"Again:

"'The trumpet's sound each fragment mote shall hear,
Or fixt in earth, or if afloat in air,
Obey the signal wafted in the wind,
And not one sleeping atom lag behind.'

"Again:

"'No spot on earth but has supplied a grave,
And human skulls the spacious ocean pave,
All's full of man; and at this dreadful turn,
The swarm shall issue, and the hive shall burn.'"

He adds, "Had the description been intended for burlesque, how could its ridicule have been made more poignant?" Certainly the poetry is excellent, but is there not a ludicrous side to its theology? The prose writing of some is of a similar character. Archbishop Tillotson, in refuting an objection to the resurrection drawn from cannibalism, affirmed that whatever became of the dust of the dead body, there would still be enough dust left somewhere of the many bodies we have had, out of which to make a new body, and continues his remarks thus, as quoted by Mr. Noble:—

"'As to the more solid and firm parts of the body, as the skull and bones, it is not, I think, pretended that the cannibals eat them; and if they did, so much of the matter, even of these solid parts, wastes away in a few years, as, being collected together, would supply them many times over. And as for the fleshy and fluid parts, these are so very often changed and renewed, that we can allow the cannibals to eat them all up, and to turn them all into nourishment;

and yet no man need contend for want of a body of his own at the resurrection, viz., any of those bodies which he had ten or twenty years before, and which are every whit as good, and as much his own, as that which was eaten.'" (Sermon 194.)

"Really," says Mr. Noble, "if the good Archbishop had written this specimen of grave philosophical reasoning in the way of irony, with the intention of throwing ridicule on the doctrine it pretends to defend, I do not see how he could have succeeded better."* Now we are diametrically opposed, in this matter of the resurrection, to Swedenborgianism, both theologically and philosophically, but in his opinion of this poetry and prose we coincide. At the same time, we trust our language, either in our former article or in this, will not be taken as in any way a personal reflection upon those sturdy defenders of the faith, whose characters we admire and highly esteem, and who on the whole have written wisely and well in defence of evangelical truth.

As to whether matter is *molecule* or *force*, we do not suppose *they* ever thought about it. And if the results of modern researches in physical science should prove matter to be either molecule or force, would their theory of the resurrection be thereby supported? We think not. On the contrary, we believe such a result would powerfully support our theory. The human molecules, if matter is molecule, would be formed according to some particular law in the case of each person, resulting in a certain characteristic organization. And force, if matter is force, would still be controlled by some law in the case of each person, so as to take shape in a certain organization. We can see that if the same law abides, the same organization must abide, whether matter be molecule or force, or neither. The same molecules, or the same force, or the same particles of matter, are not necessary to the action of the same law; but the same law continuing, we have, as the result of its action, either the same molecules, or the same particles of matter, and therefore, the same characteristic organization. Supposing this law of organization to continue at the resurrection, we are at once assured of the resurrection of the same person, whether matter be molecule, or force, or something else, without being obliged to maintain theories so open to the severe lashings of the keen logician as those we have named.

In connection with these remarks about matter, there is a *lapsus pennæ* in our former article, to which we wish to call attention. We wrote, "That which is essential and necessary

* "An Appeal," by Rev. S. Noble, sec. iii. part iii.

to the reproduction of the body at the resurrection is, not the same particles, but the observance of the same law or laws in its reproduction which governed its processes during life. Whether the matter of the present body, or any other matter, *or no matter at all,* is used in its reproduction is not of the slightest consequence." The words, *or no matter at all,* it is evident from our reasonings, ought not to be in the sentence; for on our view, as on every view, matter, in some form, is necessary to the resurrection of the dead.

The purport of the discussions in the latter part of our first article on the Resurrection was, if possible, to find some reasonable ground for believing that the Resurrection of the Dead might take place without being obliged to hold views liable, we conceive, to philosophical objections of unanswerable force. We might have rested satisfied with simply believing that as we continue the same persons in this life, notwithstanding changes in our physical substance, so we should continue the same persons in the resurrection, notwithstanding none of the particles which once formed our earthly body entered into the composition of our resurrection body; but we went further in endeavouring to ascertain what constituted the sameness of thinking beings, or persons, with the view of finding some philosophical ground for such belief. Apart from this endeavour, however, the position we take is a sound one, being based on consciousness in the present life, and on highest probability for the life to come. It is, too, an immense advance on the ancient theories we have already discussed. Indeed, some who continue to hold those theories somewhat inconsistently advance to this latter position, feeling we suppose more satisfied with the new lines of defence than with the old. Others, however, leave the old fortifications to crumble into ruins, and advance bravely to the occupation of the new. They believe that the sameness of particles is not a matter of importance, and that our personal identity will survive the mighty wreck of dissolution, whatever may become of the bodily particles. Dr. Edward Burton, formerly Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and a sound evangelical theologian, thus believed.* Dr. William Hanna, whose name is a tower of strength in matters theological, touches upon this point thus pertinently:

* "Enquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age." Bampton Lecture. Note 59. See quotation in Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," 1 Cor. xv. 50; or in the METHODIST QUARTERLY for March of this year.

"When in answer thus to the question, With what kind of body shall the dead come? Paul answers by an illustration from the planted seed, and says, Thou sowest not that body that shall be, is not the fair and necessary inference from his words, that the human body which dies and is buried is not the identical body that shall be at and after the resurrection? Had the Apostle said nothing more than that, it should have been sufficient, in our judgment, to prevent our entering upon any curious inquiries as to whether the resurrection body will be composed or reconstructed out of the same material particles which constituted it at death."*

Dr. Octavius Winslow also writes thus clearly on this point:

"In insisting upon the fact of a personal resurrection of each individual of the human race, it must not be supposed that we think that the same particles of matter in all respects will enter into our future bodies, or will be at all necessary at the resurrection. Philosophically speaking, a man is not a body composed of the same particles of matter at any two distant periods of life. And yet a full knowledge of this does not alter his consciousness that he is always the same being in soul and body. It is supposed that our bodies by waste and accretion undergo an entire change once in seven years. And yet have I not the same body I had, or am I not the same person I was, seven years ago? *May not the human form throw off by piecemeal the whole of the matter contained in its formation, and take to itself new substances of the same kind,* AND ACCORDING TO THE SAME LAWS OF ORGANIZATION, *and still preserve its conscious identity?* This is all that we plead for in the resurrection."†

The words we have italicized are very important as looking towards the solution of the difficulty which our theory supplies. To make Dr. Winslow's language fully express our thought we would alter it a little, thus—"*Because* the human form throws off by piecemeal the matter contained in its formation, and takes to itself new substances of the same kind, according to the same laws of organization, it preserves its conscious identity." These laws of organization, or, to use Mr. Westcott's phrase, "the specific formula of assimilation and combination," being unchangeable, remaining ever the same in each particular organism, whatever the changes of the mere physical substance, necessarily ensure the sameness of organization throughout the existence of the individual, and therefore the consciousness of that sameness, which is personal identity. The *result*—the organization—will ever be the

* *Sunday Magazine* for April of the present year.

† *The London Monthly Review and Record of the London Prophetical Society*, for May, 1857. Article on the "Coming of the Lord, &c." Our italics.

same, the same law continuing; but the *process*—the appropriation of particles to the building up of the organization—will be ever changing. Hence we see how our conscious identity may remain intact throughout the future, being assured to us in the certainty of the continuance of the laws of organization, or of the "specific formula of assimilation and combination." We, of course, take it for granted that these laws of organization will continue. Death is a break in our existence, but *only* a break, suspending their action for a time. But as *persons*, not only as bodies, we shall be raised from the dead, according to the Scriptures, and even as we are the same persons now, notwithstanding we continually assimilate new particles and throw off wasted ones, so shall we be the same persons then, though the matter we may then assimilate may never have been in connection with us previously; and this, in virtue of the restored action of the laws of organization, in the independency and free action of which our personal identity may be said to consist.

Because we judged that personal identity consisted in the independency and free action of these laws of organization, we discussed that subject in our previous article. Also the related subject of *consciousness*, and what enters into it. On both these points we have a few further observations to make, of general interest, suggested by the remarks of a correspondent.

We will take the question of consciousness first. On this point we differ from two classes of thinkers, the Swedenborgians and the school of Locke. The former assert that the soul is *the man;* the latter give support to that opinion by affirming that consciousness is an attribute of the mind only. If this latter opinion is correct, the logical conclusion is that the soul— the mind—*is* the man; consequently, however convenient the body may be as a mere dwelling-house for the soul, it is simply a convenience, and no more. In opposition to both these opinions, we ventured to give a third, which we think is the most philosophical and the most Scriptural, viz., that consciousness, as an attribute of human nature, may be the result of the union in our personality of the two substances of matter and spirit—or, in other words, that consciousness may be an attribute of the *person*, and not only of the mind or spirit. Consciousness cannot be analyzed; we can only classify its phenomena: and we are bound to include all the phenomena of human nature under the phenomena of consciousness. We cannot define consciousness; we should require another consciousness to do so. We cannot exhaust all that is in consciousness from the side of spirit alone, nor from the

side of matter alone; we can only exhaust all that is in it when we unite the two in our philosophy as they are united in fact in human nature. Consciousness is an attribute of the Ego, of the "*I*," and whatever enters into and composes the Ego must necessarily enter into and compose the consciousness of the Ego. It may be asked, "Because man is dual, body and spirit, does consciousness therefore belong to the former as an essential attribute? Is it not enough that it is personally connected with it?" But if man is dual, how can consciousness, as an attribute of human nature, be excluded from either part? We say consciousness, *as an attribute of human nature*, as contradistinguished from the consciousness which may belong to spirit as such; for though we have said that consciousness, as an attribute of human nature, ceases at the point of disunion of the two substances which enter into our personality, we do not thereby deny all consciousness to spirit, as such. Spirit may have a consciousness of its own; and though from reason alone we can obtain no support for such a belief, we believe the Scriptures afford sufficient evidence to assure us of it. Waiving that, however, it is evident that consciousness, as an attribute of *man*, is personally connected with the body. But how? There lies the mystery, to solve which (if it can be solved) would be the sublimest attainment of philosophy and the grandest achievement of science. We can just see enough of that mystery to affirm that consciousness belongs to the whole personality, and not simply to the mind alone; and this, without going so far as to speculate whether matter and spirit are in essence identical. The bearing of these remarks upon the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is very important, as refuting the psychology of the Swedenborgians and their notions of the resurrection based on it,—as giving greater unity to our conceptions of man himself,—and as showing the necessity for the resurrection of the dead if *man*, and not a part of him only, is to live in the future world.

In reference to personal identity, we have stated that "personal identity is the intuitive conviction of each thinking being that he is himself and not another." This language, possibly, is open to objection on the ground that personal identity lies behind and presupposes all conviction. True; but we endeavoured to show that the root-idea of personal identity is, Am I myself and not another? rather than, Do I by changes become another? Changes vitally affecting the personality cannot be supposed, as Butler says—"Now all beings confessedly continue the same during the whole time of their existence," for one such vital change would amount to

a virtual annihilation. The question it seems to us is, Given the sameness of the thinking being throughout the whole time of its existence, what constitutes that sameness at any one moment? Why can a man say, I am myself and not another? Butler affirms this much—that personal identity *is* the sameness of the thinking being; but he does not go further and show what constitutes the sameness. And it may be that as each man's consciousness or intuitive conviction that he is himself and not another is a simple belief, beyond the reach of analysis, it is impossible to get at that which is presupposed in such consciousness, viz., personal identity and what constitutes it. Except, indeed, we can approach it through personality. Hence if we ascertain what constitutes the difference between persons, or thinking beings, we may be on the way to a completer solution of what constitutes the sameness of thinking beings. We were thus led to think that there is a law or that there are laws governing each personality—the processes of the animal economy, and we quoted the following words of Mr. Westcott in our support: "We cannot understand by body simply a particular aggregation of matter, but an aggregation of matter as representing in one form *the action of a particular law*, or rather the realization of a special formula. The specific law or formula of assimilation and combination is that which is really essential and permanent."* Now may it not be that in virtue of the permanent action of this "specific law" or "formula of assimilation and combination" each person continues and will continue to be assured throughout his whole existence that he is himself and not another? Are not all the probabilities of the case, short of absolute certainty, in favour of this supposition? Do we not thus get nearer to, if we do not get at, that which constitutes the sameness of thinking beings, or personal identity? The bearing of these reasonings also on our subject is most important. If here, in virtue of the operation of a "particular law" or "formula of assimilation and combination" we continue the same thinking beings, independent of the changing particles which successively come under the operation of such law, shall we not hereafter continue the same persons in virtue of the action of the same law (supposed to continue), wherever the particular particles which it may assimilate and combine may come from, and whatever the nature of our physical substance may be? Have we not the evidence of the highest probability that such will be the case? And if so, are not all sceptical objections to the resurrection of

* "The Gospel of the Resurrection," chap. ii. p. 141. Our italics.

the dead drawn from the dispersion of particles and their consumption by vegetables, animals, and men, most effectually refuted?

So that, in brief, the views to which we object are these—first, that in some way the particles composing our present bodies, or the bodies laid in the grave, are necessary to the resurrection of the dead; and, secondly, that there is an indestructible "germ" in our present body which is to be the seed of our future body. We believe that the sameness of particles is not essential to sameness of personality—that our personal identity continues the same throughout all changes of physical substance—that we may be raised from the dead without having in connection with us any of the particles which formerly were connected with us—that the language of St. Paul—"thou sowest not that body that shall be;" "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him;" "it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body"—plainly teaches that our resurrection bodies will not be in all respects identical with our present bodies—and that as we are conscious now that we are the same persons we were twenty or thirty years ago, notwithstanding our bodies have entirely changed their substance, so shall we be conscious at the resurrection that we are still the same persons, notwithstanding our resurrection bodies may not be in substance identical with our present bodies. On some of these points, however, we are all agreed. It may be said we are all agreed, first, that there will be a resurrection of the dead; secondly, that our resurrection bodies will be the same essentially as those we now have, and that personal identity will be preserved intact; thirdly, that our only assurance of the truth of this blessed doctrine is derived from the Scriptures; and, fourthly, that it is a vitally important truth, connected as it is with the chief verities of our faith, and certainly one of our chief sources of hopeful consolation. On these points we all agree most heartily and happily. The point in which we differ concerns the *mode* of the resurrection. The question which divides us is, How will it come about that we shall be the same persons at the resurrection?—a question which derives its importance chiefly from the fact that, according as we answer, will be our ability to answer successfully all philosophical objections which may be and are advanced against the doctrine. The one opinion is that the same particles are necessary, or that the same actual bodies laid in the grave must come out of the grave, if the same persons are to live in the resurrection with the same bodies they had upon earth. Our opinion is that the same particles are not essentially necessary,

to our resurrection. This we endeavoured to show in the latter part of our last article on the subject. Our conclusion was, "If our bodies at the resurrection are reconstructed according to the laws which governed them and their union with our souls during the present life, we can see clearly how each person may have his own body, inasmuch as personal identity consists, not in the sameness of particles, but in the independency and free action of the laws of each individual personality." Dr. O. Winslow, as seen above, looks towards the same solution; but Mr. Westcott states it in full. We again quote his important words from our previous article:—

"With regard to man there is nothing unnatural in supposing that the power which preserves his personality by acting according to the individual law of his being in moulding the continuous changes of his present material body and all that depends on it, will preserve his personality hereafter by still acting according to the same law in moulding the new element (so to speak) out of which a future body may be fashioned. In other words, we can understand how the law which now rules the formation of our body may find its realization hereafter in some other element, while the new body will be essentially the same as the old one, as expressing the corresponding action of the same law in relation to the new sphere in which it may be supposed to be placed."

The first objection to which at the first blush this view is liable is that it is *unscriptural.* If by this is meant that it clashes with Scripture truth, we think there must be either a misunderstanding of Scripture, or a misconception of our view. Instead of clashing with Scripture, we venture to think it harmonizes with it. In the first place, the Scriptures confessedly teach nothing as to *how* we shall continue the same persons at the resurrection; they presuppose the fact that we shall be the same persons, and are silent as to the *modus operandi.* Our endeavour is, by the independent path of philosophy, to arrive at a knowledge of *how* sameness of personality, or personal identity, will be secured. So far there can be no disagreement. In the second place, there are words used in Scripture which harmonize with our view completely, though they do not set it forth: as, for instance, "Thou sowest not that body that shall be,"—"God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him,"—"All flesh is not the same flesh," joined to "So also is the resurrection of the dead,"—"It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body"—"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,"—"We shall all be changed, in a moment,"—"Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious

body,"* and others of similar import, all implying a bodily change and presupposing our essential sameness. We may classify the Scriptural evidence for our existence in a future state, thus:—First, we are taught that the spirit of man exists after death;† secondly, we are taught the resurrection of the dead;‡ thirdly, we are taught the incorruptibility and immortality of the resurrection body;‖ fourthly, we are taught that there will be an eternity of rewards in heaven for the righteous, and an eternity of punishment in hell for the unrighteous;§ fifthly, the Scriptures assert the resurrection of Christ, and teach that He is the first-fruits of the resurrection harvest—at once the pledge and prophecy of the resurrection of all.¶ This abounding Scripture testimony as to our future existence is unaccompanied by any intimation that our resurrection life will ever cease to be, either in heaven or in hell; on the contrary, Jesus says of the children of the resurrection, "Neither can they die any more." Once raised from the dead, we continue in existence for ever, either in the heaven of communion with the Father, or in the hell of banishment from His presence.

In the third place, it is a significant fact that the Apostles never once use the phrase, "resurrection of the body," or "resurrection of the same body." This seems to indicate that the "resurrection of the dead"—the proper Scripture phrase—has a broader meaning than is often given to it,—that it includes more than the mere resuscitation of the body, even the resurrection of the whole person, the reappearance in life with a complete humanity of those who for a while had been subject to death. Dean Stanley, in his note on 1 Cor. xv. 35, says: "It must be borne in mind that what the Apostle is endeavouring to establish is not the *identity*, but the *change* of existence, not 'the resurrection of the body' (a phrase which never occurs in the New Testament), but the 'resurrection' simply."** In other words, the whole man, and not a part of man only, was in the Apostle's thought when speaking of the resurrection. John Locke also says: "In the New Testament I find our Saviour and the Apostles to preach the *resurrection of the dead* and the *resurrection from the dead* in many places:

* 1 Cor. xv. 37—39, 42, 44, 50—52: Phil. iii. 21.
† 1 Sam. xxv. 1; xxviii. 15; Mark xii. 25; Luke xvi. 22, 23; xxiii. 43.
‡ Ps. xvi. 10; Job xix. 25; Isaiah xxvi. 19; Ezekiel xxxvii. 5; Luke xx. 35, 36; John v. 28; Acts xxiv. 15; 1 Cor. vi. 14; Rom. viii. 11.
‖ 1 Cor. xv. 53, 42.
§ Matt. xxv 46.
¶ Acts xxvi. 23; Phil. iii. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 20, 22.
** "The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians," by A. P. Stanley, M.A.

but I do not remember any place where the *resurrection of the same body* is so much as mentioned."* Dr. Hanna, in the article from which we have already quoted, thus forcibly refers to this particular:

"Our common usage of the term (*Anastasis*, 'resurrection') has almost limited it to the raising of the buried body from the grave—so that whenever the resurrection of the dead is spoken of, it is the raising of the body, and it exclusively, that we think of; but in its Scripture usage the word has a wider sense, and while not excluding, nay, as we shall see presently, while including the idea of a re-embodiment of the spirit, it takes in the broader thought of the reawakening of the dead to life. You meet often in the New Testament with the expression 'the resurrection of the dead,' but never with the expression the *resurrection of the body*. More than once you find the resurrection of the dead spoken of in a way that proves the expression to have been at the time employed as equivalent simply to the future existence of the dead; but you never meet with the phrase occurring in such a connection as to show that it is the revivification of the body and that alone which is meant by it."

Dr. Burton, in his Bampton Lecture, to which we have already alluded, infers that the Grecian philosophers and the Gnostics, whom St. Paul opposed, "denied the resurrection in any sense of the term,"—that "they did not believe in any future state of the soul at all." The Apostle opposed this belief by preaching the resurrection of the dead, meaning *not only* the resurrection of the body, but our existence, *as persons*, in the future world. Hence we stated previously that "resurrection does not primarily refer to a state or condition of personality, but to *persons*. It may be that it is concerned neither with the body nor the soul, separate and distinct from each other, but with the two as united in man, as forming a person." With these facts and inferences our view is in complete harmony.

But the theories we oppose are supposed to be founded upon Scripture; and hence may arise the impression that our view is unscriptural. The "germ" theory relies upon St. Paul's illustration of the seed, which, by being treated as an analogy, affords it some support. But we have shown that to treat the Apostle's illustration as an analogy is to wrest his meaning and purpose.† The other theory relies upon passages of Scripture which are chiefly figurative and tropical in their character; such as, "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth,"—"Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the

* Letter to Bishop Stillingfleet.

† See METHODIST QUARTERLY, for June, 1871, pp. 101—104.

dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead,"—"Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones; . . . I will lay sinews upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and ye shall live,"—"And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them." * Although tropical and illustrative, these words have a definite meaning; but it is doubtful whether a sound exegesis would deduce from them the doctrine that the actual body laid in the grave, or the actual particles some time in connection with it, are essential to the resurrection, as understood by St. Paul. It is evident, as we said before, that these "illustrative Scriptural expressions are descriptive of the resurrection comprehensively, and are not intended to literally describe the *process* of individual resurrections."

We may add there are many who believe that at the resurrection we shall be essentially the same, whatever may become of the *same numerical particles.* So far these are all open to a similar objection of unscripturalness. The "germ" theory also implies that the same numerical particles are unnecessary to our resurrection, except the particular particles constituting the germ. On the "germ" theory the body laid in the grave cannot come out of it, and therefore, on the same grounds, must be unscriptural. Surely these various views evidence a general desire to escape the difficulties involved in the notion we are combating! And, surely, that must be a hasty judgment which pronounces the method adopted to attain this object to be an unscriptural method!

The Rev. C. P. M'Ilvaine, D.D., an American divine, states an objection which may be thought to apply to our view. He asks, "What is meant by the resurrection of the dead?" and replies that some say "the only meaning is, that the soul shall, in the last day, be re-invested with some body to dwell in; not *its own body* that it before inhabited, but *a* body, no matter whence produced." This is tantamount to saying that each person must have the very body put in the grave united to his soul in the resurrection, otherwise he will not have *his own* body, but *a* body, and instead of a resurrection there will be simply a *substitution* or *re-creation.* We do not know to what theory this objection will apply except it is the Swedenborgian theory. That the objection does not apply to our view, or any like it, Dr. M'Ilvaine himself unintentionally shows. After affirming that "Job certainly expected to rise

* John v. 28, 29; Isaiah xxvi. 19; Ezekiel xxxvii. 5, 6; Rev. xxi. 13.

from the corruption of the grave *in his own flesh*, his own body, that very one which worms would devour, and not another," he uses these words, "When we say *the same body in which he died*, we do not mean the same in all qualities and powers, but the same *essentially*." And further on, in answer to an objection that the same particles have become part of the bodies of animals and men, he says the force of this objection "is in the contradiction which it seems to involve. That contradiction depends on the assumption that, in order to the identity of the body in death and the resurrection, *the same numerical* particles must compose it. If there may be essential identity without numerical sameness in all the parts, the contradiction is avoided, and the objection fails." Exactly; but what, then, becomes of the very body which the worms have devoured, and which a man must have ere he can have *his own body*? Here Dr. M'Ilvaine seems to contradict himself, or at least so modifies his former strong assertions, that he does not really mean that the actual body devoured by the worms, but only that the same body *essentially*, is necessary to be raised for each man to have his own body. So that a man *may* have his own body in the resurrection without the actual body devoured by the worms being disturbed at all, except by the worms, as "in order to the identity of the body in death and the resurrection, *the same numerical* particles" need not "compose it." Dr. M'Ilvaine thus kindly answers his own objection; or rather, he turns his own objection against himself, and then leaves it, for the theory he combats at the beginning and the theory he propounds ultimately are one. He adds, "What is it that is essential to such identity we know not. It is enough here to know that it is not *numerical sameness of particles*." Yet following these words we read an eloquent paragraph beginning, "'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death,' and even the dust 'of his saints,'" depicting the soul traversing in deep meditation the places of the dead, and ending by saying, "Not a particle of their dust has perished, however widely it has wandered. All are waiting 'the day of redemption.'"* If the language of this paragraph is rhetorical or poetic, and used with a view to present with vividness the great truth that the same men, *essentially*, are to be raised, it is well; but if no rhetoric or poetry is intended we cannot reconcile it to former statements, where it is plainly said that numerical sameness of particles is not essential to identity.

* "The Truth and the Life." Sermons by Charles Pettit M'Ilvaine, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of Ohio. Sermon xv.—Resurrection of the Saints. Author's italics.

We can see that if the laws of each organization continue at the resurrection (and they are supposed to continue), each person will have, as the result of their action, not *a* body, but *his own* body, the same body *essentially*—a resurrection which will perpetuate each person's consciousness that he is himself and not another—a resurrection which will identify him with all his past life, and link his past to all his future life. Such a union of body and soul will be a true resurrection, and not a substitution or re-creation,—it agrees with Bishop Pearson's definition of the resurrection, "A substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again,"—and it harmonizes completely with the Scripture revelations of a future life, and with reason. We believe, and our theory compels the belief, that the resurrection body will not be an airy nothing—mere ether with a film of substantiality—but a substantial form, adapted to a spiritual state of existence. The body is "sown a natural body"—a body adapted to our present mode of existence; it shall be raised "a spiritual body"—a body adapted to a spiritual mode of existence. Nor will our assumption of a spiritual body be accidental. There will be a vital connection between *this* body and *that*—a connection so vital that our consciousness shall suffer no check, nor shall our personal identity be in the least degree jeopardised. The spiritual body will be the natural—or rather the supernatural—outgrowth of this; the blooming of the spirit into a more perfect development of glory will result in a body after its own likeness; and each individual life, from its commencement in this world to its highest perfection in the next, will be homogeneous.

A further objection may take some such form as this: "The theory you oppose presents a grander exhibition of the power of God and of His omniscience than the theory you defend: there is something vast, even sublime, in the thought that God preserves intact the dust of all who die, however numerous and involved the transformations it may undergo, and that he will at the last day single it out from amongst the elements, giving to each man his own, or so much of it as may be required to form a spiritual body: you must sacrifice all this mighty exercise of power and omniscience on your theory: therefore, presumptively, we may infer that ours is the sounder view."

We grant there is something sublime in such procedure; but, in the first place, no theory can shut out the power and omniscience of God from manifestation in the resurrection of the dead. In the second place, it is not simply a question of

Divine power and omniscience, but also of Divine wisdom—not of what is mightiest to the senses, but wisest to the intelligence. A sudden display of omnipotent energy would be grand, but the never-ceasing and far-reaching operations of Divine wisdom, to a quickened intelligence, are grander still. But, in the third place, it is not a question whether there will be a magnificent display of Divine power, omniscience, and wisdom (this is beyond dispute), but whether it is *necessary* that the same dust of our present bodies should be gathered from the four quarters of the globe before the dead can be raised. Is it *essential* that the particles assimilated and combined at the resurrection should have formerly belonged to us? If not, does it follow that we shall not have our own bodies or be ourselves? Let us ask, What will govern the assimilation and combination of particles? The Divine power and wisdom *immediately*,—or *mediately*, through and by means of the laws of each organization? Either method would secure the same result. The latter, however, has the merit of being in harmony with the general analogy of the Divine government, so far as we know it—a government in which a marvellous adaptation of means to ends more or less simple or elaborate, seems to rule, and in which immediate exercises of the Divine power are the rare exception. The more our knowledge of the universe increases, the more do we perceive the all-pervading presence of law, by which we mean, to adopt one of the Duke of Argyle's definitions, "the combinations of force which have reference to the fulfilment of purpose, or the discharge of function;"* and from analogy it is inferred that law is everywhere, in the intellectual and spiritual worlds as in the physical world. Nor do we, in thus admitting the fact of universal law, necessarily weaken in the least degree our faith in a personal, an ever-ruling Deity. "The stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being," to use Mr. Arnold's scientific definition of God, is not God, but the evidence of God's ever-active presence. To the eye of physical science, God, as a personal Being, seems, we admit, to be completely hidden, and nature presents mere law as under-lying and linking together all phenomena. But mere physical science does not present us with an exhaustive analysis of nature. A higher science still—the science of consciousness—carries us beyond mere natural phenomena and compels us to the conclusion that law itself—that every "stream of tendency"—is existent only as long as something higher than itself is existent. The law which science sees is itself a wheel within the wheel of

* "The Reign of Law."

a higher law still; and so we are compelled to ascend until we come to that which is not law in that it *makes* law, even to a Divine will whose volition, and whose volition only, is the fount of all law—the sole origination of the "stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being."

Now God's power does not become less effective, but more, nor is its manifestation less grand, but more, when it is exerted mediately through law, instead of immediately, without the help of law. The use of means may soften the power somewhat by making it less abrupt in its exercise, but the wisdom shines the more resplendently. This method of the Divine operation lifts us out of the sphere of mere physics and physiology into the intellectual and moral—even spiritual—sphere, and by so much as the intellectual, the moral, and the spiritual are in their nature and operations higher and grander than the physical, by so much does our view of the resurrection of the dead present a grander manifestation of the Divine attributes than the view we oppose. That the Divine power works within the lines of law detracts nothing from its force or grandeur. It heightens it, rather. It allies it to intelligence, and wisdom, and goodness also, and the mind is compelled to stand in awe before the astonishing yet orderly complexities of the Divine government. And as our future existence will, we suppose, develop our intellectual, moral, and spiritual nature into a fuller and more vigorous life, so (we may infer) will our convictions of the importance and significance of law as the wisest and grandest use of power or force deepen and strengthen. The fact that the resurrection of the dead, rightly considered, as much concerns the soul as the body, harmonizes with and confirms these views.

"But," it may be further objected, "what then becomes of the miraculous element? Your view ignores it, or at least throws it into the shade, so that it seems as if the whole process of the resurrection were a mere natural development—the regular result of the operations of law." The hiding of the miraculous, however, is only apparent. We need not here attempt to ascertain whether or not miracles themselves are but the temporary operations of higher in the region of lower laws. In the view we oppose the miraculous element appears in the individualising of the dust of each body, and the body of each person, and in its resuscitation and adaptation for a spiritual state of existence. In our view we affirm that all that is necessary to the resurrection of the same persons with their own bodies is the continuous action of the laws of organization peculiar to each, and the miraculous appears in this, that

God only knows those laws of organization and all their minute variations, and He only can restore the action which death had suspended. If to make a law be a miracle, to restore a law after its suspension must also be a miraculous act. If creation be a miracle, the re-creation implied in the resurrection of the dead must likewise be a miracle. The miraculous element will further appear in the adaptation of our restored personality to a spiritual mode of existence. On the former view, the miracle would occur chiefly in the realm of physics, and would resolve itself into a mere stupendous exercise of power; on the latter the miracle belongs to the realm of metaphysics—it would be a miracle of infinite intelligence, involving the exercise of infinite wisdom. But no view whatever of this subject can exclude the miraculous element. We depend wholly on the Divine will for our quickening at that day. There is no natural order of things that will bring about that result. "All our springs are in God," and we wait upon Him for the fulfilment of the prophecy—"this mortal shall put on immortality."

It may be said, "On your theory, however, would it not be wrong or inconsistent to pay the body we put into the grave the respect we do, and be drawn to the grave side, as we are drawn, with such strong affection and love?" We think not. Is not the grave, containing the body of one whom we loved, the symbol of past hopes and joys and tenderness, and also the prophecy (in virtue of our faith in Christ) of the future—of future re-union and of the perpetuation throughout eternity of all that made our mutual relationships so dear and precious? We do not think chiefly, if at all, of the actual dust which we laid out of our sight, and over which the words "dust to dust" were read; we think chiefly, perhaps only, of him whom the grave represents,—of him who once animated the now dead body, but who is now a spirit, happy and waiting for us; and, flying swift as an angel in thought, we again link arms and walk and talk together through the fair mansions of an eternal heaven. But, alas! we are still in the body, and the grave is the chief earthly link which connects us with the departed, and we cannot but respect it. Affection prizes every relic of the sainted dead, but no relic is so dear as the grave, on which we plant sweet-smelling and ever-blooming flowers—emblems that all is not dead, though the body is. When we see those whom we loved again we shall we satisfied, and we are assured that "them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."

So far the objections we have noticed concern our view in particular. There are some general objections to the doctrine

we wish we had space to notice fully; we can only indicate them, however. If it is true that the particles at any time composing our body—in life or at death—are necessary to our resurrection, it necessarily follows that personal identity consists in the identity of particles. And if personal identity consists in the identity of particles, it necessarily follows that we are not the same persons now we were (say) ten years ago, as during that period our entire physical substance has changed. This conclusion, as contradicting our consciousness, is absurd. The theory, therefore, which logically leads to it, cannot be a correct one. Again, it is objected that we have many bodies in our lifetime, and it is asked, Which body will be raised? Some inconsistently reply, the one laid in the grave, all the rest, of course, being rejected, without any reason for their rejection being assigned. We reply that it is sufficient if the same laws of organization continue, as their continued action will ensure to us the same body whatever changes it may undergo. Again: "Is it just to punish a man in one body for deeds done in a different body entirely?" Those who differ from us have either no reply to give, or in giving one they must adopt ours, viz., that a man may be the same person and not have the same identical body in all respects, as personal identity does not consist in the identity of particles. This answer also suffices for the objection, that the same body, having in some instances, by consumption become a part of other men, and the same particles therefore belonging to more than one body, it is impossible for the same body in both cases to be raised. Again: "The dust of the dead body is dispersed all over the earth in time, and cannot be gathered together again." Some reply that the power and omniscience of God is sufficient for the purpose. We reply that such an exercise of power and omniscience is unnecessary, as personal identity consists not in sameness of particles. It is also objected that millions die in infancy, and some before birth, and it is asked, How will these obtain bodies at the resurrection, seeing they have not had sufficient particles in connection with them to form a body of convenient size? Again those who differ from us can only reply by adopting ours, viz., that the laws of organization continuing, particles will be assimilated and combined till the growth is complete.

Some sceptics, opposing every view of this doctrine, affirm that the resurrection of the dead is *impossible*. St. Paul answers this objection—"Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may

chance of wheat, or of some other grain: but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body." If the seed that dies lives, we may die and yet live. But Christ has risen from the dead, and that accomplished fact is a sufficient refutation of the objection. And Christ is the first-fruits of the resurrection of all men, for "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

"But it is at least improbable." No; it is exceedingly probable, for interests depend upon it sufficiently vast to call for the interposition of Divine power for the purpose of effecting it. And we find support for its probability in some analogies of nature; lovely Spring, rising in new-robed life from the grave of winter; the seed which from its death of corruption rises into a fair-blooming life; the worm, rising from its earthly worm-state to its aërial butterfly-state, a "flower-angel;" the sickly, wasted body, stripped of its beauty and shorn of its strength, rising gradually into the full bloom of perfect health and full strength of manly vigour; these and plenty of others are analogies which show the probability of the resurrection of the dead. The truth of Scripture brought to them gives them a deep meaning.

"But *how* will the dead be raised, supposing it to take place." This we have endeavoured to show in part, and in part only. Deep mysteries encircle the subject, and call for patience, prudence, and devoutness in thinking of them. Some (the Swedenborgians) say we are raised immediately at death—that the soul takes to itself a substantial form, or rises with a substantial form, leaving the shell of the dead body for ever behind, for, they say, the soul only is the man, and the body merely its temporary instrument, and no more. This view is rejected by all orthodox theologians, and is, we believe, unphilosophical and unscriptural. Others say the body put in the grave will come out of it, or that a body will be fashioned out of the particles which belonged to us during life, and so we shall be raised with the same bodies and be the same persons. But this view is open to many grave objections, as we have seen. The other view is, that the same laws of organization continuing, our personal identity is thus assured to us through all changes of physical substance and form—throughout our whole existence; that at the resurrection the temporary suspension of those laws by death will cease; and that, as the result of their continued action, the same animal economy will in each case be sustained, subject, of course, to the changes which our adaptation for a spiritual state of existence will necessitate. This theory we believe to be Scriptural,

philosophical, and in harmony with the analogies of the Divine government. It preserves the unity of man (an important consideration), comprehends all the facts of the case, effectually answers all the philosophical objections which have been brought against the doctrine, and enlarges our conceptions of the wisdom of God. We cannot offer demonstration in proof of it, as the nature of the case does not allow of it; but the highest probabilities are in its favour, and there are none against it. And, so far as we can see, there is nothing to prevent its practical influence being in the highest degree beneficial, for no one, we should think, believes that intellectual difficulties are favourable to spiritual growth and activity.

H.

Art. II.—WORK AND WAGES.

Some years ago, that is soon after the discovery of the Australian gold fields, the *Times* newspaper proclaimed that the millenium of industry had dawned upon the world, and especially upon England. It compared our condition to that of a man retiring to rest at night in possession of a moderate competency, and when he awoke in the morning found himself heir to an immense estate, which, with due cultivation, would yield him boundless wealth.

According to general impression this is still more truly descriptive of our condition now than it was then. Within the last two years a new era of commercial prosperity has opened to us, far surpassing all previous experience. Of course, capitalists, merchants, and manufacturers are the first to reap the advantages of this revival of trade. But the artizan, the mechanic, and the toiler in every form, now asserts himself to be the brother of the capitalist, the merchant, or the manufacturer, and not his slave, or merely hired servant, as he was once considered to be; and as such, like the man in the gospel, he puts in his claim for a share of the new-found inheritance; asks, indeed, that it be divided with him. Hence the agitation that has been going on for the last twelve months for diminished hours of labour, and increased pay for the work done. Less work higher wages, is the cry now ringing from end to end of our land, nor has it been raised in vain, or with slight results.

Is the cry just? Are the raising of it, and the success with which it has been raised, auguries for ill or good to the nation?

In itself the restriction of the hours of labour within reasonable limits may be regarded as good. When toil, and especially exhaustive toil, whether of brain or muscle, is too protracted, it cannot but produce physiological, social, and moral evils of a fearful kind. These evils again are aggravated by the unfavourable conditions under which, in most cases inevitably, the toiler fulfils his task. This opinion is held, not by ministers and philanthropists only, but by statesmen and physicians, and men who investigate the subject on purely scientific grounds, and is founded on data which ensures correctness. There are those, however, who, while they admit this to some extent, yet affirm that long hours of work is the choice of the least of two evils; that in fact to diminish the period of daily toil would be to introduce greater evils than those complained of as resulting from the present, or, we might write, the late system. More leisure for those who earn their bread by the sweat of their face, they contend, means more time spent in the public house, and so more drunkenness, debauchery, and dissipation. Surely then, it is a kindness not to grant additional leisure to those by whom it will be so abused.

But it is worth while to inquire, whether the habits of intemperance, which are so distressingly prevalent among the working classes, were not in the first place induced by excessive and protracted toil. When a man has worked, not only till he is tired, so that his sleep is sweet to him, but until all his vital energy is exhausted, he is under great temptation to seek relief in the use of stimulants; and their use in such cases almost invariably leads to abuse. At any rate, if whether a diminution of the hours of labour will increase or diminish intemperance is a problem yet to be solved, there can be no harm in trying the experiment, for we know as a fact that long hours do not empty gin palaces, or beer shops, or keep our industrial population sober.

And it may be worth while further to inquire whether, as to the intemperance which we so much deplore among our artizans and labourers, they are not in the matter sinned against, as well as sinners. By what temptations and inducements presented to them by others are they drawn into this pernicious and degrading vice. Verily all the blame does not rest upon them; a good deal of it belongs to society—to our legislature—and to the cupidity of those who deal in intoxicating drinks, who will be rich though they get their riches by the personal, domestic, and eternal ruin of those

who yield them their coveted revenue. The stern arm of the law ought to deal with this latter class as well as with those who fall into "the temptation and snare" they set for them. But unfortunately it is not so, either through the fault of our legislators, or our magistrates. Of this we have glaring evidence every week in the town from which we write. The victims of drink, to an appalling number, are every Monday morning brought before the bench to be exposed and punished, but those who victimize them escape with impunity, and scarcely a whisper of condemnation can our magistrates deal out to them. Why should not the list, published in Tuesday's newspaper, contain not only the names and addresses of the inebriates, but also the names and addresses of those who supplied them with that which caused their inebriation?

We repeat our affirmation then, that though a man may abuse his leisure hours, yet to keep the time of labour within reasonable limits, is in itself a good. It gives opportunity for the necessary recruiting of the exhausted energies of the body, for the due exercise and improvement of the mental faculties, for the desirable cultivation of domestic affection, and for that proper enjoyment of life which our beneficent Maker certainly designed the conferred boon to yield to its possessor.

And so with regard to an adequate, or we might say a generous and ample remuneration for labour, this in itself is just and desirable. "The labourer is worthy of his hire;" and that hire is never to be taken to mean the merest pittance on which he can live, or keep body and soul together. It is an ordinance of God that the ox shall not be muzzled that treads out the corn. And does God take care for oxen only? Or says He it for our sakes? For our sakes—for the sake of the *human* race—no doubt this is written also, that he that ploweth should plough in hope, and he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. Here the right of the producer to a subsistence, and a generous subsistence too, is asserted, and this right is sanctioned, yea given, by the great Maker of us all. And who can but admit it to be reasonable that they who work should eat; and as highly desirable that they who are distinctively the sons of toil should have the means of getting sufficient food, and suitable clothing, and comfortable homes for themselves and families. The man who can with satisfaction, or rather the man who can without dissatisfaction, look upon an ill-clad, famished, and badly-housed population, whatever his relation to it may be, is wanting in all those qualities of heart which make him worthy to bear the name by which he is distinguished.

But we now look at the question from another point of view, for necessity compels us to do this. A nation is but a larger family. A more correct and instructive conception of it, we think, cannot be entertained. How then do families thrive? Not by entire absence from work certainly, nor by having as few industrial members in them as possible. A family thrives as the hive thrives by having an abundance of working bees in it, and as few drones as practicable. And how do families decay? By ceasing to be industrious and economical, by allowing the outgoings to exceed the incomings, or being content to have the latter barely reach the former. And the well-being of the national family is regulated by the same laws as the domestic family; the causes of prosperity and decay are the same in both instances. An idle, or profligate nation, for the two vices need not be conjoined to produce the result, whatever its natural resources may be, will never, in the long run, be a well-to-do nation, as the history of several nations presenting themselves to the reader's memory convincingly shows.

Again, many things may be desirable for a family, and which would greatly contribute to its comfort and happiness, the possession of which it is obliged of necessity to forego. They are things which, for want of ampler resources, are not practicable to it nor attainable by it. And so a prudent family is always found living according to its means; seldom up to them, never beyond them. When the means are scanty there is corresponding economy practised—economy at times so rigid that it perhaps approaches to pinching and privation; but when the means enlarge the style of living becomes more generous; there is less toil exerted, and more relaxation and enjoyment allowed. Now the question is whether, as a nation, we are rich enough to afford the relaxation from toil (with the diminution of our productive resources which it involves), and the increased award for labour (with the higher cost of food, clothing, and housing, which necessarily follows), that is now so generally sought and nearly as generally obtained. A full or decisive solution of this question is not perhaps so readily to be obtained as some may suppose or others desire. In more departments of life than the religious we have to walk by faith, and not by sight. Probability and not demonstration have to be our guide. It may, however, be necessary to remind our readers that this is a question which neither masters nor men, neither capitalists nor manual workers, neither philanthropists nor misanthropists, can settle of their own mere wish or will. It is determined by the stern and inexorable action

of laws or forces evolved from the facts of our financial or commercial condition. A nation no more than a mercantile firm, a family, or an individual even, can have leisure and abundance by merely willing to have them, or making them objects of desire. The question is one of ways and means, and to live, or to attempt to live, beyond these cannot but end either to the individual, the family, the commercial establishment, or the nation making the experiment, in either temporary or permanent failure and ruin.

That as a nation we are in the process of making such an experiment is the belief of some and the fear of others; and those who are the subjects of this conviction and dread are not of the habitually croaking class, or of those who are accustomed to deal out at random ill-considered opinions. They are rather convictions held, or fears entertained, by men of great information and correct intelligence, men too of unimpeachable integrity and true practical benevolence. The President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, whom we personally know to be all we have just stated, said but a short time ago that the flood tide of prosperity in the cotton trade of Lancashire had reached its height, and that a recession had already set in. The raw material was 70 per cent. higher than it was exactly twelve months ago, and the cotton trade was never profitable for a long time when the raw material was at an unusually high price. Indeed he looked forward to very considerable distress connected with the staple industry of Lancashire. This was spoken of a bill introduced into Parliament by Mr. Mundella proposing to impose further restrictions upon the hours of labour in cotton factories of adult women. Another member of the chamber said people generally appeared to think that this question of the hours of labour was merely a question of a few hours in the week between the employers and the operatives. But in the limited concern with which he was connected he found that the proposals contained in the bill would, if carried out, cause a change to the extent of £20,000 a year. This shows that while on many accounts it may be desirable to have women work fewer hours in the factory, or perhaps not work there at all, which we presume most will admit with regard to married women, yet what is desirable is modified by what is practicable; or, as we have before put it, whether it can be afforded. Evidently the gentlemen whose opinions we quote think that, as things now are, the utmost limit has been reached in that direction.

Then there is the staple trade of Yorkshire. Respecting this a highly respectable firm, in an excellent address to their

workpeople explaining why they have decided to run their mills short time, say:—

"The present times are most difficult and anxious for those connected with foreign and distant markets, many of them unremunerating at old prices, and having now to sustain the shock of an advance in wool and worsted little short of 100 per cent. during the last fifteen months.

"So rapid and extraordinary an advance, or anything like it, has probably never before been experienced, and we know of no market likely to become remunerating under such altered conditions."

The internal trade of this country has had a sudden and remarkable revival, caused by a concurrence of events, but more especially by the termination of the Continental war. By that war a void had been created, which is now being filled up, and almost every branch of industry participates in the general prosperity. Is this visitation of prosperity rightly used? The authors of this address think not.

"Labour is for the moment scarce (abundant?) and the working classes well employed, and it is at such a time when they should be storing up such inestimable privileges with thankful hearts, they are taught that they are 'masters of the position,' and may exact their own terms. They seem, to a certain extent, to have the ball at their feet, but they may kick it too far; they may get the bit between their teeth and run away with the coach, but let them beware they do not overturn it! Designing people may tell you that property is plunder—that the working classes are deprived of their rights—that they are the great producers of wealth, and as such ought to participate in a greater equality.

"Foolish delusion! They might tell them with greater truth that equality is open to all in this free country—*that* equality at least to which every right minded man aspires—for to none is denied the opportunity of advancing in life, of acquiring honour and influence, and reaping the fruits of his own industry and honest exertions.

"But that the idler, the dissolute, the profligate, the drunkard, should expect to be on an equality with the steady, hardworking, temperate, and industrious man, is an insult to common sense.

"'Nine hours' work' now seems to be the battle cry; but do the working classes sufficiently realise to themselves that this means, in plain terms, one-tenth less work done at one-tenth greater cost in wages and motive power. The present, but probably too fleeting, moment of prosperity might generally admit of such a concession; but we have to look at the future, and we must beware lest we kill the goose which lays the golden eggs.

"We will not discuss the question whether ten hours labour is too heavy a tax upon the working classes, or whether the new programme of the more idle of them, 'to do the smallest amount of

work in the fewest number of hours,' is likely to conduce to the prosperity of the country. We would simply ask, '*Can the manufacturing interest stand it?*'"

This question is answered by hints and intimations rather than in a categorical way. There is the competition to fear from foreign countries, which have longer hours and lower wages. Our manufacturing supremacy is no longer what it was, but is being assailed, and that successfully from all quarters. We have continental rivals to compete with. We are no longer the workshop of the world; but, instead of the manufactured article, we are now sending in rapidly increasing quantity our wool and our yarn abroad, to come back and compete in our own markets. And then what has been may be, or rather will be, again. Periods of prosperity have always been followed by periods of adversity. Speculation is also once more running riot through the land, and reckless schemes are painted in false colours to attract and eventually ruin the credulous and unwary. The bubble will burst again as it has burst before, and therefore who can say that before the year closes the tide of adversity may not again be rolling in upon us.

We have called this address excellent, but while we acknowledge its general excellence we do not concur to the full with the gloomy prognostications here indulged in. The future we hope is not so laden with woe as this writer supposes. That the past should be inevitably repeated in the future we can hardly take as an incontrovertible axiom. Bubble schemes may be floated before the public, but surely the experience of a few years ago, with all its lessons of wisdom, has not yet been forgotten. Nor can the prosperity which has visited the country be deemed factitious, it is as real as prosperity can be. The writer admits that at present it might generally admit of the concession of "nine hours' work" demanded by the working classes. How granting that concession is analagous to killing the goose which lays the golden eggs, we cannot see. To our apprehension it seems more likely to conserve her life by checking over productiveness. As to our manufacturing supremacy being assailed by foreign countries, who can compete with us under such decidedly advantageous circumstances, that is no new fact, nor are we aware that it exists with an intensified severity towards us, and yet old England manages to hold her own, and we believe will do to the end. To be the workshop of the world we trust is not her ambition, for she can live in comfort and happiness without attaining to such a position, or else we fear there is little comfort and happiness for her. It must further be taken into account that

the movement for diminished labour and advanced wages is not confined to our own country; it extends to all countries. This will tend to preserve the present relation to each other of the industrial nations of the earth, and thus prevent us being placed at the disadvantage so confidently predicted and earnestly insisted upon.

The vanity of indulging in prognostications of the future may be illustrated by many examples: one appropriate to the question we are writing upon rather singularly comes to our hands. A very remarkable man has just gone to his grave, taken there by vast numbers who had great respect for his character and true sympathy with his long and manly life. The late Samuel Bamford was as true a patriot as he was a political radical, and his autobiography is as charming a book of its kind as was ever written. His death brought his "Passages in the Life of a Radical" to our mind, and in the concluding chapter of that work we find him thus speaking of England's manufacturing future—

"Next come the manufacturers, working at the wrong end. . . . There they are, striving for cheap bread, as if it were present salvation, and forgetting what all history is constantly proclaiming, that nothing human is fixed—that crowns, sceptres, dominions, institutions, establishments, and monopolies, are ever changing, each departing from their old seats; springing up anew in other places, and leaving deserts where they formerly flourished. Tyre, Sidon, Carthage, Greece, Rome!—all the departed nations of the world warn us of this; and still we remain as if we were unconscious that our end must come, is coming—nay, is almost at the threshold.

"What, then, 'shall we do to be saved?' We must look our difficulties in the face like men. The times which have been never will return; we cannot recall that which has departed, and is still going; we cannot, any more than we can still the ocean, prevent our manufactures from being set up in other nations. We have read them too profound a lesson for that. We have exhibited the spectacle of a small community combating the world, and buying and beating it all round. We have shown the secret of our strength, of all warlike strength; and they will act upon it. We have shown them how our manufacturers produced commerce—which produced wealth—which created credit—which supplied taxes and loans illimitable, and enabled us to wield with tremendous effect all the resources of our vast navy, and our numerous armies; beating those we encountered, and subsidizing the remainder until we either had time to beat them ourselves, or could get others to beat them.

"And will not the nations lay hold of this wonderful power, and try to render it available to their own interests? Most certainly they will. The novelty of the thing itself would be a great temp-

tation; and though no one nation may manufacture to the extent that we have done, they may manfacture for themselves, and they will do so. America, with its cotton fields, and its teeming population, will spin its own yarn, and weave its own cloth, whether we will or no; and the nations of the continent will do, are doing, the same. They have nothing else to do in peace, nor can anything be more natural than that they should do so. We cannot, must not, always be spinners and weavers for the world; and if we could I do not see it is desirable we should. Let these truths be impressed on our minds; and let us, like a community of sensible men, calculate all our disadvantages, and prepare for the worst."

The above was written under date of July 27th, 1842, so that the writer went to his grave, after the lapse of thirty years, without seeing his predictions fulfilled; and without, we are sorry to add, seeing what he deemed the only effective preparation for the worst made, namely, not only the repeal of the bread tax, but the cutting down of all other taxes to the core, and our national expenditure placed on a most rigid scale of economy. England's commercial prosperity we believe runs no danger of suffering a permanent collapse, nor do we think it is to be secured only by transforming its industrial population into beasts of burden. If the demand for less toil is made for right purposes—if it is the embodiment of a higher intelligence and a more fully developed humanity among our artizans—we sympathise with it, and rejoice that it is made. It is a proof that our civilization has advanced a stage in a Christian direction, and that it is telling amongst those where we thought its influence was least felt. And as to increased pay for the work done, that is a matter of simple necessity. The necessity existed before shorter hours of labour were asked for, but that point conceded the necessity is heightened as a natural result. But higher wages do not always mean that the recipient of them is better off; that depends upon the purchase power of the money he receives. We all know that the same sum of money will not now purchase so much food and clothing as it would some time ago, nor as a rule can houses be had for the same rent. An advance in the price of labour carries with it an advance in the price of everything else. The question of work and wages therefore affects all classes of society, and some, by the advance movement now going on, suffer severely. The remark of the *Times*, made some years ago, is still correct; that those who have to live on fixed incomes which continue unaltered not only do not partake of the prosperity of the country, but severely suffer by that which brings abundance and happiness into the homes of others.

One word on the other side. If the agitation for increased leisure and higher wages be only to gratify an idle and sensual disposition; if the object sought in the former be merely to do the smallest amount of work in the fewest number of hours; and if the means gained by the latter be squandered in reckless and riotous living, making by them provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof; then certainly the nation's prosperity will not be promoted thereby, but rather the nation's ruin accelerated. A family, whose livelihood is dependent on industrial resources, would, by idleness and profligacy, be burning the candle at both ends, a process which could only terminate in one result. And it is just the same with a nation like our own; if its resources are on the one hand diminished by less work done, and on the other wasted by dissipation, it is only a question of time as to when our prosperity shall collapse, and be succeeded by adversity all the more severe by the contrast it brings. But we hope better things of the working people of England though we thus speak.

ART. III.—THE POSITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE FREE CHURCHES.

IN dealing with the subject we propose to discuss in this paper, it may be proper at the outset to give a definition and explanation of the terms used to set it forth.

By Free Churches we mean churches that are free from state patronage and control—free in a political sense, in so far as their own choice is concerned; free to live and act by their own power without leaning on any external power at all; free to subsist upon the means supplied by the willing hearts and ready hands of their own members and friends; free to worship God and to carry out all their christian principles without being dictated to, or interfered with, by any parliament or governmental authority of this world whatever; free in any and every sense in which the Nonconformist Churches of this and other lands may claim and hope to be free.

How those on the other side may like this use of the word free, we do not know exactly, seeing that it implies bondage on their side; but facts are facts. Accordingly, we are quite ready to convert this implication into a plain and emphatic statement. We say there is bondage on the other side—bondage, of course, in every sense in which on the side of Nonconformity there may be said to be freedom—and that bondage is none the less real to us, and, before we have done, we shall show it is coming to be none the less real to some of its subjects, though some of its badges of service may be said to be golden ones, a slave being none the less a slave though he be well fed, well clothed, and well housed; a prison is a prison even though it be a palace.

The object we have now before us is to consider the position and prospects of the churches which are not thus bound, and intend not to be, whatever may be the inducements held out to tempt them to it, but which are rather calmly and firmly resolved not only to preserve the freedom they already possess, and which we have attempted to define, but also to increase and perfect it, so that they may be all the better equipped for the attainment of all other kinds of freedom possible and lawful to them.

From the preceding paragraphs, it will be easily seen that, by the position and prospects of these Free Churches—we mean their political position and prospects—their position and

prospects in relation, for instance, to the great question of national education, in the broadest and fullest sense, from the teaching of the alphabet of our common mother tongue, to the communication of the most finished and splendid discipline, with the completest equipment, to be furnished by our glorious Universities; their position and prospects in relation to the complete disestablishment and disendowment of all churches, Episcopal and otherwise; their position and prospects in relation to perfect religious equality, all through and all round; in relation to the time when the English Government shall know no distinctions or differences whatever in the churches of England; in relation to the time, when, in so far as churches are concerned, it shall simply be England for Englishmen, or, if our readers prefer it, free Christian England for free Christian Englishmen.

With the history of these churches, in regard to these great subjects, we have, at present, nothing to do; but we may be pardoned for asking our Nonconformist readers to join us in remembering it, with honest pride in our Nonconformist ancestors, and with gratitude to the Almighty Ruler, as a glorious, though sad and painful, history. Sad and painful it is, because of exclusion, oppression, and persecution, on the one side; but glorious it is because of heroic fidelity to principle and conscience, and because of mighty victories won against overwhelming odds, for truth and liberty, for God and man, on the other side.

Moreover, remembered thus, the past may well inspire and stimulate all Free Churchmen for the future, especially as the future, like the past, for some years at least, will be one of battle, though, thank God, not of blood surely.

We Free Churchmen contend now for that for which our fathers have contended, more or less from the beginning, for that which is, ever has been, and ever must be, the essential object of all Free Church contention—complete ecclesiastical equality before the secular governmental power. The very name we take to ourselves, as exemplified by the title of this paper, among a thousand other much more significant and powerful things than mere names, irrevocably pledges us to this.

We have been told, in days gone by, that we have the fullest toleration, and so ought to be quiet; and there are persons living now who still talk to us in this patronising, unmanly, and unchristian way. All such talk, however, we fling back to those who are wicked or stupid enough to indulge in it, saying: Friends, toleration is a nasty word, and should never

be used excepting of nasty things and nasty persons. You may talk, if you are foolish enough, and sufficiently careless of the public weal, of tolerating the bad sewerage of some of our towns and villages; or, if you are not thoroughly English and Protestant, you may talk of tolerating the Romanism of our glorious national bulwark of Protestantism; you may tolerate all you are silly or sinful enough to tolerate besides, but pray do not talk of tolerating us dissenters. Remember we have just as much right to talk of tolerating you as you have of tolerating us. We have more right, indeed, to talk thus than you have, for we seek to take nothing from you that really belongs to you, whereas you have ever compelled us to struggle and fight before we could wrest even our natural rights from your strong grasp. But, henceforth, let both sides drop the word which, when used in the sense we condemn, is ever inherently and grossly insulting to those to whom it is applied, and none the less shameful and humiliating to those who apply it. We propose this more for your sake than for our own; for while the history of this odious word, in its church relations, must serve to remind you chiefly of common though priceless rights, withheld by your ancestral priests and tyrants from good and brave men; it serves chiefly to remind us of the glorious way in which those same good and brave men won those same rights from those same priests and tyrants. Toleration will not satisfy us, for we are not rebels, beggars, or sycophants; but men, Englishmen, and Christians; we are not seeking mercy nor asking alms, nor kneeling for favour and privilege; but fairly, lawfully, manfully, patriotically, and christianly asking for, and, if you still resist us, demanding our rights. The unalterable motto and watchword of the Free Churches is equality and no surrender.

We should deem it a waste both of our own time and trouble, and of the time and trouble of our readers to attempt, in any formal way, to illustrate the justice of the claims thus stated, seeing that it is so self-evident that no man having the smallest title to our regard would dispute it.

We must, however, draw the attention of our readers to the very significant fact that the justice of these Nonconformist claims is endorsed by the spirit and general course of modern legislation in Europe generally, and in England especially. Confining ourselves, for the mere sake of brevity and pointedness, to our own country, we ask what is the spirit and general course of modern legislation but this—the destruction of all merely arbitrary class distinctions, and the putting an end to all unjust monopolies! This is plain and palpable, from the time when

some of the common rights of Dissenters, as citizens, were first granted, down to the last great reform in the army, the abolition of "purchase." We, therefore, ask why may not this spirit of modern legislation be allowed to logically and consistently work itself out in all its consequences, in all departments of national life? Having admitted it into the domain of all other things, why attempt to shut it out from the domain of the ecclesiastical and religious? We say why attempt to shut it out, but we ought to say why attempt to turn it out? for it is too late simply to pretend to shut it out; it is in, and it will have to be turned out before it can be shut out. It was let in when governments began, after much entreaty, graciously to dribble out to us dissenters practical acknowledgments of the (to some of them) painful fact that we were alive, and could not really help sharing the common needs and common claims of other men; and it has been working in the place then and thus granted to it ever since. They who object to its being in should have begun the work of exclusion sooner. We may say to them—"Very likely you were not aware what a strong-limbed, vigorous-willed creature was being admitted; but that is as it must be now, especially seeing that said creature has grown so strong and healthy, by the entertainment thus provided for it, that you cannot get rid of it now do what you will. Nor is it any use for you to ask it to stop where it is, seeing that, as a thing of life, it must, according to the unalterable decree of the Giver of life, either realise all its righteous possibilities or become a miserable caricature, or a flat contradiction; and of this alternative Nonconformists will doubtless take care. But, apart from the action of Nonconformists, what will the nation do in this matter? Tried by the principles of its own legislative acts, in the days in which we now live, it is bound to take some decided action in relation to ecclesiastical and religious monopolies, as well as in relation to the monopolies which are not of this character. Without the complete sacrifice of consistency and honour, it cannot stand still where it is in this respect. In consistency and honour, it must go on to the end of the course it has marked out for itself, in the destruction of unjust monopolies in general, or it must stultify itself by going back to the very beginning of that course. What then is the nation to do? Are we, as Englishmen, to confess that the spirit of modern legislation thus exemplified is wrong? Are we to proclaim to the world that we have befooled ourselves by all that has helped to give to our modern legislation its distinctive character? Was the abolition of the Test and

Corporation Acts a mistake? Was the Catholic Emancipation Bill a mistake? Were our two last Reform Bills mistakes? Did Sir J. D. Coleridge's bill, in regard to our universities, go too far? Was the destruction of the Establishment of the Irish Church wrong? Was the abolition of the purchase system in the army wrong? There are, it may be, just a few persons in the United Kingdom who, would say yes to all these questions. But, making our appeal as we do to the great mass of the people, we have no doubt of the answer to be given. We are sure that, to these questions, there comes from the very heart of the nation a decided and overwhelming affirmative. The instincts of the people, and the reflective powers of the thoughtful, rise up at once against the very supposition that this spirit of modern legislation is wrong, and that the national acts to which it has led are not just and wise. And if we are thus obliged to pronounce this spirit of modern legislation not wrong, but right; if we are thus compelled heartily to accept the national acts which have already resulted from it, nothing remains for us, as a nation, but inconsistency, cowardice, and guilt, if we do not allow it fully to develop itself to all its legitimate issues, all round and all through our national life, ecclesiastically and religiously, therefore, as well as civilly and socially. From this it also follows that any English government which is not disposed to condemn and abolish the unjust ecclesiastical and religious monopolies which still divide our national life, along with unjust monopolies of every description, proves itself utterly unworthy of this nation, and of this age.

The very great importance of this national endorsement of the justice of Nonconformist demands, as well as the self-evident justice of those demands viewed in themselves, has been felt for some time, not only by Nonconformists, but also by a considerable number of others, and notably by various persons holding high place both in Church and State. As one result of this combined feeling of Nonconformists on the one side, and these various persons in Church and State on the other, there have been, for some time, two very opposite schemes for the promotion of religious equality, more or less, before the public mind, namely, "levelling up" and "levelling down." Let us look at each of these in the order in which we have now placed them.

The levelling up scheme is deeply interesting, both as to its origin and its nature. We have just indicated its origin, but must now be a little more explicit. There can be no doubt, then, that this scheme is the embodiment of the thoughts of

men who see clearly that, judged in the light of modern legislation, as well as in the light of reason and common sense, the Church of England, so called, as a national establishment, became a failure the moment dissent became a fact (as any such establishment would, in any country, under the same circumstances); and that this failure of the establishment was registered by the nation when it granted the right of peaceful life to dissent. These men see, further, that the more dissent grows in power and numbers, and the more the failure of the establishment becomes manifest; and that, therefore, considering the vast numbers of dissent, and its deep and varied influence on all the affairs of this nation at the present day, it is worse than folly to pretend that the Episcopal Church is now anything more than a sect among many other sects. Consequently, they also see that to justify its continued possession of the national monopolies, which it now so inequitably holds, an effort must be made to make it once more a national church. Now there are only two ways in which an effort of this sort can be made, viz., by instruction and persuasion, on the one side, leading to conviction and acquiescence on the other, which is fair, manly, and christian; or by persecution, which is unfair, unmanly, and unchristian. Of the latter of these plans we will content ourselves with asserting the fact that it is quite out of date in this country. The principle of the former plan is being acted upon by the promoters of this levelling up scheme; and so, though the establishment is broad, high, and low at the same time, already, Dean Stanley, with others, wishes to make it broader, higher, and lower. That which is already "built on a compromise, and made up of comprehension" is to be more of a compromise still, and still more of a comprehension. She who has opened her arms to a most unnatural width already is to open them wider still, saying to all of us, "Come in, come in, and be a happy, though very queer and rather large family. Yes, all come in; let there be no difference, Protestantism and the Thirty-nine Articles notwithstanding."

But to this mode of producing religious equality, the great bulk of Nonconformists are, and must be, in the very nature of the case, opposed. Our grand, all-comprehensive objection to it is that it is utterly unchristian and basely false in principle. It ignores completely, and would full destroy, our most essential conceptions of what a Christian Church is; it sinks the Establishment to the very lowest level of a mere instrument in the hands of the secular power; it tends to dethrone Christ as the alone head of His Church, and allows

to Him, even from those who use His name, but an accidental or circumstantial reverence. Against it, therefore, we utter our solemn protest.

In so far as we ourselves are directly concerned, our solemn protest against this levelling up policy is not affected at all by any ulterior question as to its working. But we submit, for the benefit of all whom it may concern, that this scheme cannot be made to work in any decent and endurable way. How indeed, in this world, or in any other part of the dominions of the all-just One, can that which is so false in principle be expected, especially in the long run, to work decently and endurably! Rather should we accept it, as a matter of course fact, that all false things will collapse sooner or later. And, pray now, what have we actually before our eyes, as one of the most palpable facts of the day, but quite a demonstration that this same Erastian and unchristian scheme must end in dead failure.

In the first place, the attitude of Nonconformists, just indicated, towards this scheme makes the full working of it a sheer impossibility. A truly national church in this country is now out of the question, inasmuch as large and growing numbers of the people could on no account join a so called national church, no matter what form it might take.

But, in the next place, the state of affairs in the Establishment, as it already exists, is also fatal to the scheme before us. Does not all the world know that there are manifestly too many sorts in the Establishment already? Does not the Low Church hate the High, and the High the Low? And do not both think the Broad Church a very wicked and daring creature? And does not the Broad Church find it a useless thing to attempt to keep the other two quiet? Facts, without end almost, could here be easily produced to show how hopelessly divided the various parties in the Establishment are; but as we shall have occasion to refer to these facts again, for another purpose, we hasten to leave them for the present. Before doing so, however, we would remind our readers of all classes that it is not possible to find such differences as those in question among the Free Churches of the country. The Free Churches differ in some minor matters, but they agree to differ in these, for the sake of the grand essentials in which they are one. Returning, however, at once to the point immediately in hand, we ask does any sensible man calmly suppose that to add to the already conflicting elements of the Church would bring about peace and quietness? If the three parties already in are

in such violent and deadly conflict, what could we expect of the thousand and one parties that would be compassed by the Establishment, if all the religious sects of the land were to be gathered into its capacious embrace? If now conduct is exhibited and language spoken in ecclesiastical assemblies of churchmen, which would be a positive disgrace to any assembly of gentlemen, what could we look for then? If the clergy of the Established Church, sometimes in their priestly pride, as in the case of Mr. Purchas, and sometimes in daring unbelief, as in the case of Mr. Voysey, or Bishop Colenso, even now flagrantly break the ecclesiastical laws of the land, upon whose bounties they are fed; if, now, they treat our law officers and law courts with studied contempt, what could we expect then, when priestcraft, unbelief, and hypocrisy would be increased a hundred fold? Why we could expect nothing less than something terribly disastrous, either in one way or another.

Now we should have thought that in the fact that we have thus demonstrative evidence, not only in the conscientious protest of Nonconformists against its very principle, but also in the circumstances of its partial development in the actually existing Establishment, that this levelling up policy must needs end in anything but success and honour, would have been a timely warning to its friends and supporters against its further development, and should have led the whole nation, as such, to attempt to crush it out of existence altogether, or allow it to wait till we get a good deal nearer to the millennium than we are at present.

But the friends and supporters of this levelling up policy have not been thus warned against it. Nor is the nation, from any cause whatever, quite ready to deal with it as we have suggested. Hence not only is this policy, in its general bearings, still kept before the public mind, it has also been put into particular operation by Her Majesty's Government in their Education Bill. It is clear that if the bill in question means anything distinctively, as it is actually working, whatever may have been the design of its mysterious originator, it means levelling up, with a great many degrees in the process, for all who are big enough and loose enough to accept what is offered, and gross injustice for those who are too weak or conscientious to take the nation's money for that which is not national. Hence, as the case actually stands, the Established Church is getting, as before, the lion's share to help to teach its violently conflicting dogmas, and to spread its irreconcilable forms, which are simply repudiated by millions in the United Kingdom. The Romish Church comes next with its degrading

superstitions, and sending the other to perdition, though there be actually many a sad and glaring resemblance between them. Last of all come one or two other denominations, taking what they can get. We are very sorry to see these latter in such strange company. What a pity, for instance, that the Wesleyan denomination, with its mighty force, does not rise in lofty scorn—a scorn worthy of itself—against the alliance it has thus formed with the Church that cast out its founder, and with that other Church whose corruptions of the faith of Christ it has always professed to abhor!

We have just made incidental reference to some who may be too weak or too conscientious to share the national spoils the Government is so loosely dealing out in this matter. We should be sorry to think that the Nonconformists, as a body, are too weak for this; but we do hold that they are too conscientious. That which compels them to object to the levelling up policy, in relation to the Church, leads them also to oppose it, in relation to the school, which, in these days, as Archbishop Manning has reminded us, is becoming more and more closely connected with the Church; more and more an important essential among its agencies; more and more an introduction to it. This policy in this, as in all other forms and in all its applications, the consciences of Nonconformists oblige them to oppose, no matter by whom supported, whether by the Liberal or Conservative party, or whether by a mere clique or an established government.

We thus come to the fact that levelling up in the School, as also in the Church, must of necessity fail in so far as Nonconformists and their friends are concerned. Hence it is that individuals, in different parts of the country, are refusing, as a matter of conscience, to pay the rates the Education Bill requires them to pay for denominational purposes; and town councils, like Birmingham, are refusing to pay the public money for mere class purposes. But supposing Nonconformists should be continually ignored in this matter, and this levelling up scheme be worked, as far as possible, without them, and in spite of them, we should like to ask with what results will it be thus worked? This is a question for the consideration of all Englishmen, altogether apart from classes, churches, and creeds, the results of a national act being, in the nature of things, of national importance. We wish then to point out what we believe to be the more than probable results of this system fully carried out, in the way just defined, in the present state of the world and of this nation.

We believe, and we think we can show, that this policy

of concurrent endowment, this creation of a more wrongful political-religious Establishment than any that has yet existed amongst civilised and christian men, must, if allowed to bring forth all that is actually and potentially in it, fill the country either with Romanism or Infidelity, or an outrageous mixture of both.

In illustration and confirmation of this belief, we will, for the present, confine ourselves to the working of the Education Act. We trace the influences and tendencies of this Act towards Romanism in this way:—Denominationalism being given to England and Wales, what should keep it from Scotland? And, if given to the three other parts of the United Kingdom, what shall keep it from Ireland? No fair dealing certainly. No man knows that better than Cardinal Cullen and Archbishop Manning. And if denominationalism gets to Ireland, what becomes of the Irish nation? Why it becomes, more than ever, absolutely enslaved, body and soul, to the priesthood; the Pope, not in theory only but in practice, being put before the Queen, and our Government having no control of the people, but such as must be within the higher control of the priests. In the mean time, what will be actually doing in England? What is actually being done now in England by this unwise and impolitic scheme of the Government? Why it is notorious that, besides what is being taught by the Romish Church itself, Romanism, pure and simple, is being taught by our so-called Protestant Church. That Protestant Church so-called is helping the Romish Church to spread the Romish faith, and that by the funds of this Protestant country; and all that the other Protestant sects, who are receiving government money, can do to counteract this, as all the facts of the case prove, will be but as the small dust of the balance; while all who conscientiously refuse the government money for sectarian purposes must be placed at a very unfair disadvantage in all the efforts they make to avert this Rome-ward tendency. To Rome, to Rome, then seems practically to be the cry of the government in this matter.

But it may possibly be made to give forth quite an opposite cry. Instead of the cry being to Rome, it may be to Infidelity. Certainly human nature, both in the individual and in the mass, is much given to such extremes. Infidelity may be produced by the educational policy of the Government in this way, among others. Shrewd, thoughtful men, of all classes, will be led to look on (must be looking on now) at these various denominations with their various creeds, forms, and mutual hatreds, all receiving the money of one common

government of the whole, and will thus naturally be led to say, "Why, here is a strange game going on. Here are these priests and parsons, these Papists and these Protestants, these Trinitarians and these Unitarians, these Episcopalians and these Wesleyan Methodists, these High Church, these Low Church, and these Broad Church men, who profess to have such vital differences amongst themselves, why they are all joining together for the purpose of getting the money of a secular government, for the purpose, indeed, of getting one another's money, wherewith to enable them to teach one another's 'damnable heresies!' Surely they cannot have any consciences; or, if they have, they are quite willing to sell them for money, or for what they think money will secure for them. Pretty guides these gentlemen are to be sure! Surely all religions and all theologies must be alike, or we are not wise to endure all this humbug. The great end of all these demands, for what these persons call "religious education," seems to be to raise up, strengthen, and make impregnable their own class distinctions, whatever may befall the nation at large. But we will not have this. If christianity comes to this, if 'religious education' means this, it must go as all other base and cruel superstitions must go." In this way we see the Government may help, by their levelling up policy, to fill the land with unbelief.

Moreover, it seems to us, that it is actually in the spirit of sceptical indifference to the distinctions in theologies, ecclesiasticisms, and religions, to which we have just briefly referred, that certain Members of Parliament, and others, of various political schools, are quite ready to support either Mr. Gladstone's Government, or any other, in any efforts it may make to fully develop this scheme of Establishment and Endowment all round.

Taking all the facts and circumstances of the case into full and fair consideration, it is clear to us that the alternative placed before the country by this levelling up policy, is either Romanism or Infidelity, or the mixture of both we have already described, which means fearful lawlessness towards both God and man, or fearful superstition and despotism of the most pernicious character, meeting our children at birth, cursing them all through life, and leaving them in awful darkness at the end.

Here, therefore, it is that we Nonconformists again take our stand in appealing to the whole nation to join us in opposition to the loose, reckless, and baneful policy before us; and here it is also we find our answer to those who are always telling us

that we are disturbing the nation merely because our sectarian interests are endangered. We frankly and proudly own that not the least reason why we oppose this levelling up policy is one which is peculiar to ourselves, and may, therefore, be called sectarian; but we earnestly and indignantly deny that this peculiar reason is the only one we have for opposing this policy. We oppose it as Nonconformists, because we believe it to be grossly unchristian, and basely false in principle; but we oppose it also as men, as Englishmen, and as Christians, because of what we believe it leads to, because of the odious alternative we have indicated, and which we believe it presents to us as a nation, and as a very important and influential part of the human race.

As men, as Englishmen, and as Christians, we long to see our country educated in the truest and fullest possible sense; physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually. We want it to be healthy, strong, and active in its limbs; vivacious and mighty in its intellect; pure and noble in its spirit. Thus we want it to be alike free from licentiousness and despotism, whether political or priestly; as clear of the superstition of all-belief on the one side, as of the superstition of no-belief on the other. We wish for it a clear and fine perception and a keen sense of truth, justice, and honour. We want it to know the pure and heavenly form of truth in all her dwelling places, and throughout her vast dominions, and, knowing her, loyally to bow before her and do her bidding. Last of all, and most important of all, we want our country to be Christian; and we want its Christianity to be made up of the enlightenment and regeneration of individual souls. Thus we want it to be qualified (in so far as human means can qualify it) evermore to take the lead amongst the nations and peoples of the earth, in all that tends to a glorious reign of highest civilization, peace, plenty, and righteousness; in all that will lead to the drawing out, the renewing, the building up, and perfecting of our common humanity, according to the ideal of the great Creator, Ruler, and Father, as we have it set before us, partly in the nature He has given to us, partly in His written word, but fully and gloriously in the person, life, and character of the man Christ Jesus. In this way, we seek, for our common fatherland the brightest crown, and the most honourable and glorious place and power, it can possibly secure.

We think we have shown the soundness of our belief that the levelling up policy, if allowed to go on, must lead to the very opposite of this. It is, therefore, on the broad human,

national, and Christian grounds just indicated, as well as on the grounds peculiar to us as Nonconformists, that we protest against that policy, and oppose it, in all possible ways and in all possible places, to the fullest extent of our power and opportunity; and it is upon these broad human, national, and Christian, as well as Nonconformist grounds, we appeal to our countrymen at large, to unite with us in declaring that, so far from accepting the odious alternative it places before us as a nation, to which God has given an exalted place and inconceivable power in the family of nations, we are resolutely determined not to rest satisfied till this policy itself, with all its merely time-serving and pitiable expedients be entirely uprooted and cast from our midst as a people; and it is upon these same grounds that we also appeal to our countrymen to join us in the resolute determination to seek, by all the means within our reach, something for England and the world that will form a glorious contrast to anything and everything any such policy can possibly produce.

Having thus treated the levelling up plan for producing religious equality, in its principles and results, in its connections and relations, we proceed to the only other plan left for consideration, viz., the "levelling down" plan. We support this for all the reasons which lead us to oppose the other. This indeed is the plan which originated with, and is supported by, the Nonconformists themselves. It is the deliberate expression of all our views, opinions, and conclusions respecting the whole general question. To it we have been naturally and inevitably led by the logic of our whole history, by the philosophy and theology of our whole system. We support it because it cuts up by the roots all political establishments of religion, of every description, seeing that it thus answers to our conviction that all such establishments are wrong, unscriptural, and unchristian in principle. We support it because it is the only way in which it is possible to do justice to all outside the Establishment, and all who cannot accept the Establishment principle. We have already said that our Free-Church motto and watchword is "Equality and no surrender." Well, that being the case, it being thus an essential and settled point with us not to rest satisfied till we get what is meant by religious equality, and this levelling down policy being the only one which can possibly secure such equality, we are as much pledged to this as we are to that. Again, we support and urge the adoption of this policy because the divisions which the Establishment created and sustains in our English national life constitute a strong and effectual barrier to our

country's rising to the sublime altitude of moral, mental, and spiritual perfection, and to the glorious leadership among the nations and peoples of the earth, we have attempted to indicate, and which, as we have said, we desire for her.

Accordingly, the theological, historical, logical, philanthropic, and patriotic position which Free-Churchmen now deliberately and calmly hold may be defined and described thus:—If any among us, in this United Kingdom, wish to preserve any old religious-political class interests, or to create new ones, let them do it at their own expense, and not at the expense of the nation. If some among us wish to make either the children or the adults of the nation into Protestants or Papists, into Unitarians or Trinitarians, Methodists or Episcopalians, or anything else not national, let them do it if they can; but let themselves pay for doing it. Freedom for all, on the same terms, to teach just what they like; but also corresponding obligation to find their own means. Let all pay for what all agree in: let the sects and classes themselves pay for their own peculiarities. Let the nation have what belongs to the nation; let the classes and sects have what belongs to the classes and sects. Let us all be simply Englishmen before the law, and in all the affairs of our common country.

Now, without elaborately discussing such principles as these, without following them into their several applications and details, we hold that any principles which can be thus stated, must, by virtue of that single fact alone, appeal, eventually, with irresistible force, to that common sense, and to those instincts of right and justice, which are supposed to be the prominent characteristics of the English nation. In the face of that common sense and those instincts, we submit that it is self-evident that only by this levelling down policy, as we have just expounded it, can there be conscientiousness, freedom, manliness, unmixed love of country and kindred, and Christian principle all round; and that, therefore, only thus can we become fully worthy of ourselves, as individuals, as a nation, and as a very important part of the great family of men which the Almighty Father has created and graciously sustains for a purpose doubtless worthy of Himself.

Such being our inevitable and immoveable position as Free Churchmen, what are our actual prospects as regards the results of the struggle in which we are engaged? Apart from our own faith in our principles, what do we see around us and before us relating to the final adoption, or rejection, of those principles by the Government and by the country?

Well, broadly and generally, we frankly admit that we see

that which seems to make it certain that we shall yet have a hard fight, but we think we also see that which seems to make it equally certain that we shall eventually gain complete victory, and that we shall yet have all the churches of this land freed from state patronage and control.

We dwelt at considerable length upon the levelling up principle because we believe there can be no doubt that it is upon the ground it occupies that the hardest part of the battle between Free Churchmen and their opponents will have to be fought out. The justice of the Nonconformist demand for religious equality being acknowledged, the whole nation, by its own act and deed, being pledged to grant that demand, the only question that remains for discussion is as to how this is to be done, whether by levelling up or levelling down; and the way in which this question shall be finally answered by the nation depends to a very great extent upon the manner in which the respective friends and advocates of the two rival systems acquit themselves.

The classes whose accidental or arbitrary monopolies are threatened seem to have a good practical understanding of the facts of the case, and, consequently, pretty clear ideas as to what they are called upon, by their own side of the question, to do. As a matter of fact, these classes, especially those of them which belong to the Episcopal Church, were never so active as now. The Episcopal Church has been more alive during the present generation or so than ever it was before. We know, of course, and fully acknowledge, that more than one cause has led to this.

The tractarian movement had not a little to do with it. That movement, whatever may have been its real origin, and notwithstanding its Romish nature and tendencies, was, in many respects, a genuine revival and manifestation of life, and the increased life thus possessed and manifested, in the High Church, provoked increased life in the Low Church; and the Broad Church owes to it more distinctiveness than it ever possessed before; the principles of the Broad Church being, all along, simply a rebound from those of the Low and the High Church parties.

But another cause of the increased activity of the Establishment is no doubt the ever-growing power of dissent, in all its length, breadth, depth, and height, upon the character and affairs of the whole nation, and especially as that power is manifested in the principles and action of the Liberation Society. From this latter cause, it has long been felt, and is becoming more and more felt, by those whose interests

are supposed to be imperilled, that something must be done, not only for religion, but also for the Establishment; not only for the sake of duty, but also for the sake of place, office, and emolument. The course which the advocates of Liberation principles, and others who sympathise with them from various motives and for various reasons, have taken with direct reference to the usurped presence of denominationalism in our national schools, deserves particular mention for the mighty influence it has had upon the clergy. It is very largely owing to this influence that in nothing has this increased activity of the tri-coloured Church of England, joined by all partisans of Establishment, been seen more than in what has been done in connection with the education movement. What vast numbers of denominational schools, for instance, were built, or intended to be built, in an incredibly short time, just because the period when application to the government for pecuniary aid in building such schools was limited. "Early in the session of 1871, a return was presented to the House of Commons which showed that 3,230 applications for building grants had been made during the preceding year, and of these 2,852 were from the managers of Church of England schools."* The marvellous zeal thus stimulated by those whom we may justly call nationalists in education, and of whom Nonconformists are the very heart and soul, no doubt had its origin and found much of its vitality in the determination of the clergy and others to so fill the country with sectarian schools, under their own management, as to leave no room for national schools under the control of the ratepayers; it was therefore a manifestation of that general effort the clergy have always made, and must, in the nature of the case, continue to make, to fully monopolise the right to teach and educate the nation, not according to the will of the nation, though the nation be allowed to find the means, but according to their own interests, creeds, and catechisms.

However, it will be easily seen that the energy thus originated and thus inspired, and with such a purpose, betokens fear, and fear is always a sign of weakness and supposed danger. The present activity of the clergy, not only in regard to education, but in regard to all that relates to their work as the religious officers of the State, shows that even they are beginning to see that the days of their exclusiveness are numbered, and that they will soon be called upon to occupy their own level simply. Hence, though we are fully aware

* See a very able article by the Editor in "The Congregationalist" for January last, on "The political revolt of the Nonconformists."

how much harder their present activity may make our Nonconformist battle, yet we are not unduly alarmed by it; for, when we look into not the least of its causes, inquire into not the least of its motives, and understand its almost principal meaning, it seems clear to us, that, to a great extent, it is but a foolish and useless attempt to resist the inevitable—a desperate and selfish clutch at that which is doomed to pass away from them—a sort of dying speech and confession, though the dying be hard, and the speech and confession be meant not for death, but for life. "With much of hope," therefore, "and without any thought of fear," we may still face the great conflict which lies before us.

But, like our opponents, we must attend vigilantly and constantly to duty, which duty is clearly marked out for us.

In the first place, our relations with the present government, and with the great Liberal party with which it is identified, demand our serious and earnest attention with a view to their speedy re-adjustment. As is well known, it is because we Nonconformists see that, from various causes, the government of the day are supporting and trying in their Education Bill to carry out the principle of the levelling up policy, and because we fear that, from equally various causes, they may be disposed or induced to support and develop it still more, that we are also afraid of being obliged, for conscience sake, to break with that great political party to which we have clung, through evil report and through good report, for two hundred years past; and that this two-fold fear of ours is not quite groundless, there is abundant evidence to show.

For a short time before the parliamentary debate on the 20th March last, on the Dublin University Tests Bill, there seemed to some people to be some little reason to hope for better things; but Mr. Gladstone's speech in that debate gives reason for little else than anxious doubt and painful suspicions to all who believe that Protestantism is essential to the highest welfare of Christendom, and, therefore, to the highest welfare of these realms.

On the other hand, we gladly recognise the fact that, in other recent utterances of the Premier, and also in certain speeches of several members of his government, as well as of members of the Liberal Party generally, we see something which is just a little favourable and encouraging, from a Nonconformist and National point of view. Lord Russell, some time since joined the Birmingham League in fear lest the government system of education should eventually place all the children of the United Kingdom into

the hands of the clergy and the priests, whom he rightly supposed would seek to use that system as a means for securing and establishing ultimate and unassailable supremacy for themselves. Mr. Lowe has many a time told us that he has always been in favour of unsectarian teaching in our National Schools. Mr. Stansfield plainly declares himself in favour of the abolition of the much-talked-of "25th Clause." Other members of the Government have repeatedly told us that the Government simply recognises the secular part of education; and Mr. Gladstone himself, even before the Manchester Conference, told the nation that the object of the Government in their Education Bill was to separate the secular from the denominational. We gladly acknowledge that these various statements and professions are just a little favourable and encouraging from a Nonconformist and national point of view; but we are sorry to add that the pleasure they thus give us, when taken by themselves, is sadly disturbed by the very palpable fact that we cannot reconcile them with the other facts to which we have referred, some of which, be it remembered, relate to the united acts of the Government, and not simply to the isolated and unofficial words of a few of its members.

Taking all the facts and statements here noticed together, those which seem favourable to Ultramontanism on the one side, and those which seem encouraging to Nationalism and Free-Churchism on the other, we find it impossible to infer from them, with anything like confidence, what course Mr. Gladstone's Government, with that portion of the Liberal party which supports it in its present Educational policy, will ultimately take in regard to the general question now before us.

But, whatever the Government and its supporters may do in relation to this question, the course which we Nonconformists must take is quite clear. Our first and present duty in this very important matter plainly enough is to endeavour, even more than we have done, to impress not only the Government but all the Liberal party with the fact that, in our estimation, legitimate liberalism and looseness, or mere temporising expediency, are far different things; that the only liberalism which we can support is above all things supremely loyal to certain fixed laws of reason, of conscience, and of the New Testament, which we, under all circumstances and at all hazards, are pledged and bound to obey. In this and all other reasonable and lawful ways, we must earnestly seek to avoid a rupture between the Liberal party and ourselves; and, if after all our efforts to avoid it, such a calamity should happen,

if, notwithstanding all we have done or can do, some cruel fate irrevocably decree either the sacrifice of our principles, or such a sacrifice of our faith not only in Mr. Gladstone but also in that portion of the Liberal party which he has for some time past been really leading against us (or allowing Mr. Forster to lead both him and it against us) as shall make it impossible for us any longer to be allied to it, on ecclesiastical questions, why then, nothing will remain for us but to form a political party of our own, and resolve to fight our own battles, single handed, or with such help as the faithful and trusty few of the Liberal party who would be sure to continue heartily with us may be able and willing to render. We earnestly trust the need for this may never come. The Liberal party are the only natural allies in political matters we Dissenters ever had or can have. We and they have worked successfully together for each other's good, and for the common good of the nation, for many, many generations. Their natural opponents have always been our natural opponents, and are so still. We, therefore, cannot be wishful to receive what we want from the hands of the Tories; for we know that if they were to give us what we want, it would not be on the ground of our right, but for their own selfish ends, which are as unpleasant to us as to Mr. Gladstone himself, or any other possible leader of the Liberal party. Not that there are any signs, at present, that, even for the sake of party, the Tories are disposed to give us what we want; the signs they just now give forth are rather of an opposite kind. The many-coloured and many-sided gentleman whom they sometimes recognise as their leader, Mr. Disraeli, in what is not very truthfully called his great speech, at the Manchester Tory "Demonstration," made it as clear as words from him can make anything (and he is always good at words), that he is quite ready to use all the power he has, or may have, to complete the levelling up policy he would have been glad, during his brief and accidental ministry, not only to inaugurate but to fully carry out, even in Ireland, through the late Lord Mayo, had it not been for the almost savage cry of opposition raised by that very Liberal party which, with such strange inconsistency, has since brought into operation, is now supporting, and may attempt fully to carry out, and that in mad defiance of its best friends, the very same despicable policy it then and thus roared down. Perhaps some of our readers may entertain the notion that Mr. Disraeli would prove himself equally inconsistent with the party that has thus humiliated itself by taking quite an opposite course to the one just indicated, should occasion offer,

or opportunity serve; but we are content just now to take him at his word, that word being no sign that he is disposed to grant the rights of Nonconformists; and we cannot forget that it is largely, if not chiefly, by the support of the party Mr. Disraeli has for years aspired to lead that Mr. Gladstone's Government are able to ignore those rights. Thus the bulk of both of the great parties in the State are against us. That the Tory party are against us is no surprise, nor cause of particular regret to us, seeing that, for the reasons given, we would rather not have their help at all, if we can possibly manage without it. That the opposite party are against us, however, is both a surprise and a disappointment, seeing that they are our natural allies, and that, therefore, it is from them we should infinitely prefer to secure the objects which we cannot on any account forego. But if the Liberal party, in union with the Tories, persist in refusing to satisfy our just demands, we repeat that we shall be compelled, in sheer self-defence, to take the independent and self-reliant action which we have just outlined, and which we have also deprecated. We could not fail surely to prefer conscience, truth, and justice, to mere allegiance to a political party, even though that party were bound to us and we to it by a thousand sacred ties.

The next part of our Nonconformist duty is towards the nation at large. We must take care, even more than we have done, that the whole country shall be made thoroughly to understand all the questions at issue between us and our opponents. We must show our countrymen the real nature, and the essentially unchristian and dishonest character of the levelling up policy. We must not allow them to forget its gross injustice to ourselves; nor must we fail to present, vividly and constantly before them, its blighting and destructive effects upon all that is honest, pure, and noble, in the Church, and in the world. With all the ability and earnestness we can possibly command, we must impress our countrymen with the self-evident justice of our own claims; with the fact that the nation has endorsed the justice of those claims, and is, therefore, pledged to grant them. We must, moreover, make it clear that, while we should be sorry to deny that we are greatly impelled by that which arises from our peculiarities, yet that that is neither the only nor the chief cause of our contention; that our Nonconformity is not stronger than our patriotism, our philanthropy, nor our Christianity. We must show our countrymen that our Nonconformity, as part of our Christianity, refines, elevates, and strengthens both the love of our own nation, which we share in common with themselves,

and the love of mankind which we share with all philanthropic and Christian men; and that, therefore, the views, ideas, and opinions, which are peculiar to us, as well as the sympathies, affections, hopes, and aspirations we share with multitudes of others, lead us to care more for the coronation of our country, and the Redemption of the whole brotherhood of man than for anything else. To sum up the whole substance, aim, and end of our duty in one sentence, we must ceaselessly endeavour, in all righteous ways, and by the use of all righteous means, to lead our countrymen, calmly and intelligently, to act upon the conviction that the carrying out of our Nonconformist principles, in all the great questions at issue between us and our opponents, and the adoption of the only national policy which can lead to the highest well-being of the United Kingdom, and of the whole human race, are really one and the same thing. Thus doing noble duty, in a noble way, we may well afford patiently to wait the issue.

In thus endeavouring to shape and determine the policy of the nation on ecclesiastical questions, we must not, among the many other signs of the times, which, separately and unitedly, light up our prospects, overlook the fact that, whilst some of the circumstances of the working of the Education Bill are decidedly against us, yet that some others of those circumstances are quite as decidedly in our favour. We submit that well-informed and impartial persons will not deem it too much for us to say that, in the general state of the country on the Education question, there are indications that just a few besides Nonconformists and their decided friends are coming surely, if slowly, to the conviction that Mr. Forster's Education Bill was, in respect of its denominationalism, a wrong step, if not an unmistakeable step backwards. Such men as the Bishop of Manchester, for instance, though they are not all prepared to speak so plainly and positively as he, yet in recent utterances they have given the discerning public reason to believe that they are being drawn, or driven, in a Nonconformist and national direction. Hence, among other things, the whispers of compromise we have already heard from these men, especially from the Bishop of Manchester himself. There can be no doubt that the chief cause which has led to these whispers of compromise, and to the state of things which they indicate, in the quarter whence they come, is the bad working of the Education Bill. Nor can the bad working of that measure be without its good effects elsewhere, in so far as the advocates of a really national system of Education are concerned. The refusal of Nonconformists and their friends to pay the rates,

for sectarian purposes, the Education Bill requires of them will, in the long run, be sure to make a deep and powerful impression upon the whole nation which will largely help Nonconformists and their friends on towards the desired goal. Certainly, about this refusal of Nonconformists and their friends to pay the rates thus legally demanded of them, we have already had a little antiquated, silly talk about disloyalty, etc. But what if a man's conscience really does make a stand between him and a certain human law, what is he to do? Is he to obey the lower law of man, or the higher law of his conscience, which to him, at any rate, is virtually the law of God? We Nonconformists, whatever others may think or say, cannot hesitate in answering questions of that sort. If our opponents tell us it is a dangerous thing thus to set up the individual conscience above the public or national law, we frankly acknowledge the general truthfulness of the remark as regards its principle; but we deny its applicability to the case before us. Without entering into the finer casuistry of the point thus raised, we say, deliberately, and challenge contradiction, that it is possible to rule this country without the slightest interference with any enlightened Christian man's conscience, and we do not suppose any one will come forward and deny that those who conscientiously refuse to pay public rates for the teaching of all sorts of conflicting creeds and forms, and for class purposes, are not enlightened Christian men. We have just said that it is possible to rule this country without interfering with the consciences of such men at all; but that is only half of the truth. The whole truth, in this matter, is this, that this nation can be governed infinitely better, more justly, more honourably, more successfully in every sense, by putting its laws into harmony with the consciences of these men than by seeking to violate their consciences, that indeed this nation cannot be governed well, justly, honourably, and successfully at all, without such harmony as that in question being effected. Now, if we Nonconformists do our duty, we may reasonably hope that this conviction will, by the circumstances, as well as by the nature and character of the Education Act, be forced upon the minds of all open to conviction, and that, as one result thereof, Mr. Forster's Bill will be freed from all support of priestly and unholy monopolies—from all, in fact, that is not strictly and purely national. In this way, among others, we may hope to gain the day, not only in regard to Education, but also in regard to other matters.

For us to gain the day on the question of National Educa-

tion is, in fact, virtually to gain the day everywhere else. The doom of concurrent endowment and establishment here, as before intimated, cannot possibly mean less than the doom of all particular establishments and endowments elsewhere; it cannot, in the very nature of the case, mean less than the disestablishment and disendowment of the Episcopal Church in England and Wales, and the disestablishment and disendowment of that portion of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, which is still in bonds. If the *general* application of the Establishment principle be defeated, no *particular* and exclusive application of it can possibly hope long to hold its ground. As religious equality must come, if it cannot come by levelling up, it must come by levelling down. That it cannot come by levelling up, we have already shown; there remains, therefore, nothing for it but levelling down. Taking this for granted, let us look how it accords, or otherwise, with some of the general facts and circumstances which have an important bearing upon the whole subject we are dealing with in this paper.

Leaving, for the sake of time and space, the Church of Scotland, with the bare reference we have made to it, let us glance at a few of the facts and circumstances relating to the case of the Established Church of England.

We begin this part of our task by recalling to the minds of our readers the fact that the levelling up policy we have examined and condemned is a public confession that the Church of England, as the Church of the nation, has long since failed; that the real originators of that policy, at least, see and frankly acknowledge that the Church of England is now but a sect among many other sects, and that, consequently, it must soon either be nationalized or put upon the common level. The only hope which they can have, therefore, in the continued establishment of that Church, lies in the wish they have to make it as broad and as long as the three Kingdoms, the Principality included. How futile that wish is we need not further show. Surely, by this time, even these broad and brotherly men must have begun to suspect that this not very original idea of theirs exhibits symptoms which prophesy death to it, of its own weakness, even as was the case with the same, or a similar, idea in the seventeenth century.*

The state of things amongst those who wish to retain the Establishment with, at least, the principle of its present sectarian character is equally, if not still more, favourable to the

*See Macaulay's account of "The Comprehension Bill," in the reign of William and Mary. History of England. Vol. II, p 285.

prospects of the Free-Churches. For obvious reasons, we will keep to the condition of the clerical portion of this class.

It is a matter of notoriety that the High Church and Ritualistic clergy profess not to be very comfortable where they are at present. Dr. Pusey, Archdeacon Denison, Revs. J. W. Bennett, O. Shipley, A. H. Mackonichie, and others, of less note, have passionately protested against the present state of things, and declare they would much prefer disestablishment. We are aware that their conduct does not quite harmonise with their professions in this respect, and that they make no sign that they are ready for martyrdom, but, still, their protests and declarations are none the less significant, in regard to the purpose for which we refer to them.

Others there are again of the clergy belonging to more than one Theological School, who, though they are unwilling to accept disestablishment, yet recognise the fact that it must come, and so are calmly waiting for it, wishing their brethren generally to make all possible preparation for the event. This order comprises men like the Bishops of Carlisle, Ely, Lincoln, Bath and Wells.

A third section of the clergy, clearly and practically recognising the distinction between the Church proper and the merely secular and political Establishment thereof, are beginning to declare their belief that the Church might prosper though that Establishment were destroyed. This third section includes men like Dr. Vaughan, Canon Liddon, and the Bishop of Ripon.

A fourth section look forward, for various reasons, to disestablishment with pleasure. Dean Alford belonged to this number when he was alive. Dean Hook belongs to it now.

A fifth section of the clergy, like the promoters of the modern comprehensive scheme, admit that the State Church is an injustice to all outside of it, and ought to terminate its reign. In this section we have such men as the Revds. J. B. McClellan (Vicar of Bottisham, Cambridgeshire), J. D. Vaughan (Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester), J. Gornal (Vicar of St. John's, Oldham). The latter gentleman has given four lectures in his own church in favour of disestablishment, which have been published.

Thus from various causes and motives, and in various ways, not a few even of the clergy who, as a body, naturally move last in such matters, are meeting Nonconformists at the point of separation between Church and State, where all the differences between them begin and end.

The quarrels of the various parties in the Church and their

general conduct in relation especially to the ecclesiastical laws by which they ought to be governed, are leading to the same point. We have referred to these things before, for the sake of showing how fatal they are to any attempts to make the Church national. We refer to them now to show the utter folly of attempting to retain the establishment of the Church as a mere sect among sects.

Not long since a Low Church oracle said—"We make no secret of regarding the antics and mannerisms of the Ritualists with contempt," and then went on describing them as "rummaging old ecclesiastical wardrobes, and getting up a fantastical display of priestly theatricals." On the other hand, certain efforts made by some Low Church clergymen to make proselytes in Ireland were stigmatised by the editor of a certain High Church production as "a Godless swindle." Now bad as these illustrations are they are far from being the worst that might be given of the matter in hand. It is a notorious fact that the whole country has been scandalised, especially in its seats of law, by the pitiable quarrels and prosecutions of the various Church parties. The conduct of some of the clergy in their dealing with the laws to which we have just referred almost strikes one dumb with the consciousness of the utter weakness of the very strongest words we can possibly use respecting it. Who at this time of day needs to be told that such men as Mr. Voysey, on the one hand, and Messrs. Mackonichie, Purchas, and Bennett, on the other, have filled every honest man acquainted with the facts of the case with unutterable disgust towards themselves, and shame for England and her Church, by evasion, equivocation, and quibling, that would be almost a disgrace to the vilest Jesuit!

However, the clergy are no exception to the rule that as men sow so shall they reap. Hence, not only have these proceedings of certain of their number scandalised and disgusted the whole nation, besides sadly disturbing the internal affairs of the Church, they are also plain prophecies of a coming downfall. They appeal too strongly to the nation as being what is significantly called un-English—palpably and pre-eminently so—to be much longer allowed. We English, with our national love of straightforwardness, cannot understand the making of sacred vows and the taking of solemn oaths in the name of God in a "non-natural sense," and no loose or Jesuitical sophistry can drive it into us. It would be much easier to drive it into the stupidest fellow in the kingdom that this conduct of the clergy is very much adapted to loosen the very foundations of truth speaking

and good morals amongst us. The remedy for this pitiable state of things in the Established Church must come, and that remedy is disestablishment and disendowment.

Another still more favourable sign of the times in respect to Free-Churchism, and in full harmony with all we have said, both in regard to the general principle of Church Establishment, and to the particular form that principle now assumes in the Episcopal Church of England, is the fact that, while for the most part, the old modes of defence have been abandoned, not only by comprehensionists, but also by all other classes of Establishmentarians, no new modes of defence that can possibly withstand a good argument has been found to take the place of the old ones. Surely indeed this fact, in itself, is quite enough to prove that the sooner the Establishment in all its forms, and in its very principle, comes to an end and the better.

Such then is the position, and such are the prospects of the Free-Churches. Though the position may be very much threatened, it is really unassailable, and, as regards its general principle, it is felt and acknowledged to be so by the whole nation. Though the prospects may be a little clouded, yet, on the whole, they are very bright and inspiriting. The whole case concerning us may be stated in this way: We Free-Churchmen have a glorious though somewhat painful past, a good substantial present, and a supremely glorious future; and we rejoice all the more because the glory of that future will not be for ourselves merely, but for our country and the world.

We hope to prove worthy of our ancestry by keeping strictly to what is just and right in the work we have in hand, and which we cannot abandon until complete victory crowns our efforts. We wish to do no harm to any church, or corporation, or individual, whatever. We are sometimes charged with a wish to injure the Episcopal Church. But that charge is only made by those who do not know us, or who, knowing us, wilfully and wickedly make the charge knowing it to be false, because, for their own peculiar reasons, they hate us. But the simple fact is we neither hope nor wish to do the Episcopal Church any harm. We rather wish and hope to do her much good. We shall do her no harm but good, by helping to break her bonds and set her free. We are sure if she were free she would be stronger and better in every sense, because decidedly more christian than she is now. And, when free, we should not like to quarrel with her as to which of the churches should go first and lead. We should rejoice to see her lead, if she

could do so in a christian way and by christian means. Possibly, indeed, some of the other churches would then be content to lose themselves within her loving embrace, if only she could but manage to define herself, and put herself into shape, as we believe she would, when she felt her own might, and knew her glorious liberty. But, be that as it may, we should all wish to be proud of her, and should ever remember her for good. We should remember, as we remember now, but with more joyous, because more unmixed feeling, the glories as well as the humiliations of her past history. We should think, with unmingled emotions of gratitude and pride, of our indebtedness to her great scholars, her great historians, divines, and preachers. In this way we should remember Hall, Taylor, Ken, Pearson, Jackson, Bull, Hooker, Butler, and others of the past; and, now and then, we should find a warm place in our hearts and minds for such men as Arnold on the one side, and Keble on the other, and for such men as Dean Milman, and F. W. Robertson of the comparative present. We have just said something about remembering her glories as well as her humiliations of the past; but we would try to forget her humiliations and think only of her glories. Remembering all the good, in free-hearted good will, we would bury the evil out of sight for ever. And, if her adherents were willing, as we hope and believe they would come to be, though not all at once perhaps, we and they might make this United Kingdom a United Kingdom indeed, which it never yet has been, and never can be so long as an Establishment, in any form whatever, remains among us. The whole nation unitedly giving instruction in all those things in which we are agreed, and the various churches separately giving instruction, in all those things about which we differ, about which we cannot help differing, about which we ought to be manly and christian enough to agree to differ; the whole of the nation and the whole of the churches being thus harmoniously at work, partly in solid and compact unity and partly in musical variety; we should have the whole nature of our countrymen, both on the material and on the spiritual, on the secular and on the sacred side watched over, guided, and educated. While the whole of this manifold process is being begun, carried on, and finished in full harmony with all the laws of Almighty God, we should build up an enlightened, godly nation; a nation strong in limb of body, and in faculty of spirit; a nation not only rich in material wealth but gloriously opulent in moral, mental, and spiritual forces; a nation which, being free from all unrighteous favouritism and unholy monopolies, would find the best men and put them to the front, apart

from mere distinctions of wealth, or rank, or family; a nation that would be more deeply, widely, and truly free than any nation yet has been in all this world; a nation of which all her sons, to a man, would be justly and greatly proud, and on which the richest blessings and benedictions of the Almighty Ruler would, more and more, benignantly rest.

W. M.

ART. IV.—CHRISTIAN THEISM.

THE mission of Christianity in our world is to teach men the knowledge of the true God. It came to assert His existence, to unveil His character, to announce His will, to enforce His claims, and thus secure for Him, from His intelligent creatures, a revenue of praise, the homage of loyal and loving hearts. For this end it claims to be considered as a distinct and supernatural revelation, a beam of light shot athwart our horizon direct from the celestial spheres. In support of its claim it points to the transcendent character of its Author, the prophetic announcements with which it was heralded, and which received in it their accomplishment, and the miraculous signs and wonders which marked its early history. Its Founder was evidently a teacher come from God, for no man could do the miracles he did except God were with him.

Christianity, however, does not claim to be the only revelation of God with which man has been favoured. He has never left Himself without a witness among His intelligent creatures. Many voices, whose sound has gone out into all the earth, and whose words to the ends of the world, have ever been employed to proclaim His existence and character. But Christianity is the chief witness for God, and its utterances are the clearest and fullest respecting God that ever fell on human ears; they are, likewise, the best adapted to arrest the attention and move the heart of man; but when that is done they implant a disposition to listen to every voice which speaks from heaven, and they make every object and every occurrence eloquent of God. We have only to listen to some of these utterances to see it to be so. "There is none other God but one; for though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,)

yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him." 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. "There is one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. iv. 6. And there is the sublime enunciation in the Epistle to the Romans. "For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

From the first, Christianity has had to fulfil its mission amidst opposing powers and influences. When Christ came into the world, the world knew not God, nor did it wish to know Him. On the contrary, this was the condemnation, that when light came into the world, men loved darkness rather than light, and not only closed their eyes to its presence, but also sought to extinguish its beams. And this condemnation has remained on the world to the present day, or, long since, the knowledge of God would have covered the earth as the waters of the sea cover the great deep. The infidelity of our times is also true to the character it has ever sustained; it is not content to present a passive barrier to the spread of Christian truth, but there is active and deadly hostility toward it manifested. The outward form of this hostility, however, the mode of its manifestation, is somewhat changed; and this change is well calculated to deceive the unwary, and those who judge according to appearance. With some slight exception, the infidelity with which we have to contend is not that rampant, crude-minded, and malignant scoffing which undertook in a former age to rid the world of all religion; on the contrary, it appears among us in the garb of science, and puts on the air, and speaks in the character, of a genuine scholarship and philosophy; its aim being, not at once to bring us to the conclusion that there is no God, or to lead us again to believe in and worship the dumb idols of the heathen, but to substitute the philosopher's god for the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This insidious spirit may be combated in two ways, first by direct confutation, from its own premises showing that it is a spirit of untruth; and secondly by a correct exposition of the truth which it seeks to subvert. This latter method we now attempt, not so much on account of the gainsayer, for we have little hope of convincing him were our voice to reach his ear, but for the sake of the believer, that he may be built up and established on his most holy faith.

We solicit, then, the candid attention of our reader, while from the last cited words of the Apostle we seek to state the doctrine of Christian Theism, and trace out the relation of God to the universe, and of the universe to God.

There are four propositions in St. Paul's words, which we may severally consider, and we shall probably find this the best way of unfolding the sublime truth he teaches.

I.—All things are of God.
II.—All things are through or by God.
III.—All things are to God.
IV.—All things glorify God.

I.—All Things are of God.

That is, with God all things have their origin, from Him they primarily proceed—He is their great first cause.

This proposition, then, is an explicit and emphatic denial of both Atheism and Polytheism, of the doctrine which teaches that there is no God, and of that which teaches that there are many gods. It in effect says, "There is a God, and there is no God save one." *There is a God.* In other words there is a Being who exists independently of nature, and who existed anterior to nature. A Being without beginning of days and end of life; from everlasting to everlasting; and without variableness or shadow of turning; a Being who never began to be, who never changes, and never dies; who is ever all sufficient and ever self-sufficient. This Being is God, and there is no other God than He. He is peerless and alone, and the very idea of there existing more than one Being invested with the attributes we have described is a contradiction and an absurdity.

All things are of Him;—the universe does not exist of necessity, it is not self-subsistent, nor has it existed from eternity. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. Every house is builded by some person, He that built all things is God. He made the world, the universe, and all things that therein are, and without Him was not anything made that is made. He is the primal fountain, the first and exclusive source, whence issue all the streams of existent life.

But this does not exhaust the meaning of the Apostle's statement. He not only teaches that God is the origin and source of all things, but that all things were made by Him according to the counsel of His own will. God was free in the work of creation, and not under any, either external or internal, necessity to exert His omnific energy in the precise way He did. But this granted, on the other hand we are not to suppose His creative power employed in a random hap-

hazard sort of a way. If we go into the physical world it is not blind impulse we see there at work, prompting to sportive thoughtless acts—acts which embody no intelligence, no design, and accomplish no wise and worthy ends. In the world we occupy and the history we make, there are hid, or deposited, infinite treasures of wisdom and knowledge. The universe is full of the riches of its Creator. Nor are we to conceive of creation as being an instructive process to God. He had not to teach Himself by experiments. He had not to acquire knowledge by any process outward to himself. The idea we are to have of creation is not that of a grand piece of patch-work, where part is added to part according to the suggestion of the moment. Nor is it that of a process elaborated in detail, as the result of previous creative acts may seem to direct or require. It was not in such a way that God made the world. No, there was an archetypal idea of the whole existing in His mind ere a particle of matter was created. The entire building was planned, was minutely and accurately drawn out, and creation was but the working out of this pattern or plan. It was only the material embodiment of the Divine idea.

And it is just the same in the world's history as it is in the world's structure; for it is more of the history than of the structure of the world that the sublime utterances of the Apostle is spoken. The whole of this history, from the beginning to the end, was mapped out in the mind of the Eternal before He had formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. The multiplication of our race, its division into various tribes, and families, and nations; its diffusion over the face of the earth, and the local settlement of its different parts; the rise and fall of nations, their mutual relations, and their varied character and circumstances were all known to Him before He issued His creative fiat, so that He is never surprised, never forestalled by any event which may transpire. Come to pass what may His pre-eminent wisdom has recognised it and prepared for it, and is never found at fault. All things are of Him, and each successive age of the world's life has been the development or fulfilment of God's counsel and will.

But some will say, Does not this make God the author of sin? Does it not cast upon Him the responsibility of all the natural and moral evil there is in the world? for who resists His will? In considering the subject, to answer these questions, we must discriminate a little. In the sense of committing sin, or necessitating sin, we emphatically say, No, to these questions. God is not, and cannot be, both on metaphysical

and moral grounds, the efficient author of sin; for sin is the contravention of His will, the breaking away from His control, the transgression of His law. But as sin exists as a veritable fact there is a sense in which God is, in which God must be the occasion of sin, or else all things are not of Him. Assuredly He wills that it may be, or it would not be; for thus far none can resist His will. But a permissive act is very different to a directly creative or necessitating act. God wills to allow, but not to make or cause sin. His fiat includes the *may* but not the *must*. When wicked, as well as when virtuous, we still live, and move, and have our being in God.

How the proposition "All things are of God" involves the consequence that sin is of God, or rather in what relation it puts God to the existence of evil, may be thus stated. God made man and not man himself, and in fixing his character and constitution He consulted only His own will. He made him just such a being as He thought fit; and He saw proper to make him a being capable of sin. But this capacity for sinning is essentially incident to a capacity for virtue. Had not God given to man understanding and conscience, had He not breathed into him His spirit and made Him in His own image and likeness, that is, with the power of deliberately thinking, of choosing and willing, and thus of originating action, he could not have sinned; but neither could he have obeyed God in the high sense in which he now can. And, then, having endowed man with his transcendant faculties, He placed him in his original relation to law; He enjoined upon him obedience; He made him responsible for his conduct; and had not this been done sin would have been impossible, for where there is no law and no obligation there can be no transgression. God then may be said to be the author of sin so far, and no farther, as He originated a constitution of moral government under which sin was possible, and under which, in course of time, the possibility was transformed into fact and became an actual existence. When this event transpired, also, we cannot suppose that God was taken by surprise; His prescience was not so defective as such a circumstance would imply. He had foreseen the event, He had anticipated it, and moulded His government to the fact which His far-seeing and unerring prescience told Him would eventually exist. Now shall we sit in judgment on God for this? Shall we arraign Him at the tribunal of our fallible reason, and presume to say that such an arrangement implicates His character, and disparages His perfections as a God, and that we ought to have been made with different endowments, and relations, and pos-

sibilities? Here is a decisive check given to such presumption or anything approaching it; "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him who formed it—Why hast Thou made me thus?"

The Christian believes that all things are of God, and he also believes, yea he knows, that the works of God are at present to some extent blotted, marred, and spoiled by the presence of evil and sin. For their existence, however, he impeaches not the wisdom, or power, or benevolence of the Most High, he holds to the truth that He has some eternal plan which includes everything, and puts everything in its place; and when perplexed by obscurity of vision in reference to it, he calms and sustains his mind with the assurance of faith, bowing at His feet with a reverent and confiding piety, and saying, "Even so Father, for it seemeth good in Thy sight to permit it to be thus." From this proposition, then, we learn this to be a fundamental article of Christianity,—that God is the original fountain of all existence. To us, Christians, there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things.

II. All Things are through or by God.

This proposition teaches us that while all things have their origin from God, after their creation they are still sustained, directed, and governed by Him. We have not a world without God, nor are we without God in the world. This is only possible to us in a moral sense. We may put God out of our thoughts and out of our affections, we may forget Him, or we may hate Him, still there is a vital connection between the Creator and the creature which is indissoluble. In Him we live, and move, and have our being. He is as much the constant preserver, as He is the original author of all things. From Him all things proceed, by Him all things are sustained and governed. We cannot rid ourselves of God, we cannot be independent of His aid, we cannot successfully resist His authority. These statements disavow and condemn three false views of the universe and its present relation to God. We may severally designate them as Naturalism—Devilism—and Pantheism.

Naturalism is the denial of God's presence and interference in human affairs. It will admit, probably, that God is the one universal Creator; it does not contend that the existence of the world is self-originated, but creation being effected, God is looked upon as having little, or nothing, to do with the productions of His power and skill. There has been a creation,

but there is no providence. The Former of all things limited His interference to, and exhausted His power in, the act of their formation. He has made the machine, but He has made it self-acting. As to the physical world, it is sustained and governed by its own native forces and tendencies, and the laws of nature will account for all the various, and extraordinary, and beautiful phenomena which may be manifested upon it. If you ask why the wind blows, the rain descends, the sun shines? and how these various agencies fertilize the earth and make the grass to grow, and the flowers to bloom, and the trees to fructuate each after its kind? the answer is,—it is nature. And as to the world of intelligent and voluntary life and action, you have the same abnegation of God. Events have their birth in, and their course is shaped by, human motives and passions only. Man's reason and will are the originators and guides of his history. He is the author of his own fortune and destiny. All is of the earth earthy, and nature and humanity are the highest powers ever recognised and adored.

The doctrine that all things are of God opposes and explodes this error; a christian therefore altogether discards such false and pernicious views of the relation between the Creator and His works. But while we discard one error let us take heed we do not adopt another perhaps equally as false and pernicious. Error must not be displaced by error, or instead of gaining an advantage we may go from bad to worse; and this is done by those who hold the second class of views we have adverted to.

Devilism may seem a harsh, but it is a truthful, designation for the belief that Satan is literally and truly the God of this world. There are those who hold this belief. Satan is the prince of the power of the air; he rules the atmosphere and ærial regions. The blight of his sway is on the sea and on the dry land. Man's body acknowledges his potent but afflictive dominion, and the heart of man is the very citadel of his strength and power. This view of things, too, they would sustain by the teachings of scripture. Now the Bible certainly teaches us the existence of the Evil One—a mighty angel fallen from his first estate of splendour and purity. And it teaches us that our world is accessible to this personation of all crime and iniquity; that by his solicitations our first parents fell into transgression; and that by his assaults or insinuations he has, more or less, led captive all their descendants, and thus involved them in sin, and guilt, and woe. Atheism, impiety, superstition, and crime are the fruit

of his influence and sway, so that he has truly a kingdom among men. After all, however, God has not given the world over to the devil; the sway of the powers of darkness is not universal and absolute on earth, whatever it may be in hell. The power and malice of the wicked are restrained within certain limits, and controlled by the will of God. Satan may be God's opponent, but he is not, except in purpose, God's supplanter and rival. The stream of human history may be tainted with evil through his interference and influence, but the source of that stream is in God, and it ever bears marks of its origin by having in it more of good than evil.

Another view of the universe and its relation to God disavowed and condemned by the teaching of the Apostle is that denominated pantheism. The construction of the term will teach us its meaning. It confounds the two, that is the universe and God, by making them identical. God is the universe and the universe is God. The universe is not properly His work, but merely a modification of His being—a form under which He exists. Pantheism, therefore, discards a creative God, and declares Him to be an impossibility. Creation can only be thought of as a change in the condition of that which already exists, and thus the creature is inconceivable except as the phenomenal mode of the being of the Creator. We state this view not to attempt a metaphysical refutation of it—that is altogether beside our object—but to show that it is not the christian doctrine of God and the universe. This doctrine presents the universe not as an emanation from God, the outcoming of His substance, a mere enlargement of God's being, or a modification of His being, but as strictly speaking His production. God created the heavens and the earth. His word framed the worlds, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. And what He created He still upholds by the word of His power. All things are of God, and all things are by and through Him, and yet all things are not God. He is above all, and through all, and in us all, and yet the Creator and creature are not the same. Man is dependent on God, and yet distinct from Him. He partakes of the divine nature, is made in the image of His Creator; but he is not a part of His person. He is capable of free volition. He is a power, and not a mere thing. He can originate the motives and control the passions by which he is swayed. He can so perform acts that they are, in the truest sense, his own. Nor is he under any law which necessitates the emotions of his heart, or the conduct of his life, to be in harmony with the Supreme will. Towards that will he may

cherish enmity, and the enmity may be embodied in action. He may be disloyal and rebellious to the Great Being who gave him life. All things being through or by God, then is not incompatible with human freedom, nor does it preclude the existence of sin.

Thus much, then, for the second proposition—all things are through God. It teaches us in the world of mind, as well as in the world of matter, in the free actions of rational man, as well as in the operation of unconscious physical law, to trace His sustaining, directing, and controlling hand. But we proceed to the next proposition.

III.—All Things are to God.

This proposition is expressive of the design or purpose of God in creation and providence, and also of the efficiency of His purpose. For Him all things are and were created.

That all things are of God and through or by God, as we have just shown, is not incompatible with human freedom, nor does it forbid the existence of sin. On the other hand we are now called to remark that man's freedom and the existence of sin does not nullify the purpose of God. Amidst the free volitions, and self-originated passions, and independent acts of our race, God maintains His supreme authority and works His sovereign will. And though disloyalty and rebellion spread through the ranks of rational intelligence, and those hearts which ought to glow with love to Him burn with hate, He is still the Most High, occupying a throne which can never be shaken, and swaying a sceptre which can never be wrested from His grasp. He ever reigns the Lord God Omnipotent, directed solely by the counsel of His own will, and restraining man's wrath and opposition, or making them to redound to His own praise. Yes, not less efficiently does he govern the spiritual than the natural world, and by Him the course of events transpiring in our world's history is directed to its final issue, with as much precision and certainty as He regulates the motions of the planetary system to the production of the various seasons and the alternation of night and day. God is never nonplussed, never defeated in carrying out His plans and purposes. "There is none that can deliver out of my hand," is His language; "I will work, and who shall let it?"

But this proposition does something more than announce the efficiency of God's will, it declares the ultimate end of all things. They begin with God, He is their origin and source; they also subsist in Him; are under His direction and control; and they shall end with Him. With a consciousness of

God's presence and interposition in all things, we can connect a knowledge of His aim and design. We know that He works, and we know for what He works. Christianity is an opening of heaven to us—an apocalypse—in which we are placed in a similar position to the rapt Apostle when the celestial voice called him up to the throne of God, and promised to show him the things that should be. By the light of the revelation of Jesus Christ we can see the end from the beginning of mundane affairs, we can trace out the future stages of man's history to its final close. Providence opens to us its arcana, and announces the goal to which it is conducting human events. And what is the great truth we discover? Why, that the first cause is also the final end of all things; the stream returns to its source and loses itself in the bosom of that ocean from which it first issued.

In what sublime language is this stated by St. Paul: "Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For He hath put all things under His feet. But when He saith all things are put under Him, it is manifest that He is excepted, which did put all things under Him. And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all."

IV.—All Things Glorify God.

This is the grand consummation to which the Divine Sovereignty will conduct His administration. But let us inquire into the meaning of this extraordinary, this sublime declaration. Does it involve the doctrine of universal restoration, the utter extirpation of suffering and sin in all parts of the universe, in a word the abolition of hell? A categorical answer to these questions is a very unsatisfactory mode of dealing with them. They require and deserve more careful consideration. The best way of treating these questions is to respond to them by presenting an outline of the mediatorial reign of Christ. To comprehend it we must rise to a conception of the Godhead generally expressed as the doctrine of the Trinity. This doctrine is not explicitly or formally set forth in any particular passage of the New Testament; the nearest approach to such an enunciation of it is to be found in the baptismal formula (Matt. xxviii, 19), or the Apostolic benediction (2 Cor. xiii., 14). Nor was the christian revelation designed to

unveil to us the hidden depths of the divine essence, the metaphysical mode in which Deity exists. Yet, as Neander observes, the doctrine of human redemption, in order to its being understood in its real significance for the christian consciousness, implies this fundamental article of the christian faith. It is, therefore, economically revealed, if not verbally announced, and Christian Theism takes a determinate form by its connection with this truth. And thus we see how all things are to the glory of God. This we take to be the sentiment of the Apostle's doxology—"To whom be glory for ever. Amen." He acts as the mouthpiece of the universe; all the works and intelligent creatures of God become, as it were, vocal in him, and by his lips render adoration and praise to the Being from whom they proceed, and for whose glory they are and were created.

ART. V.—FIRST PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL TRUTH.

Essays on the Church and Society. By J. BALDWIN BROWN, B.A., author of "The Divine Life in Man," "The Soul's Exodus," "The Home Life," etc. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row. 1871.

ANYTHING from the pen of Mr. Baldwin Brown is sure to be read with respect and attention by a large circle of admirers. He has been now for a good while before the reading religious public, and from the first has found in a certain section of it, a ready and sympathetic audience. In all communities there are persons who, without any either of the superciliousness or prejudice too often attaching to the words, are "broad" and "liberal" in their sentiments. They are probably quite faithful to the traditionary beliefs of the Church to which they belong; but they are to some degree wearied of the stereotyped forms in which these beliefs have come to be presented; and, though, by no means committing themselves to his opinions, read with both enjoyment and profit thoughts expressed in the chaste, yet manly and unconventional rhetoric of a writer like Mr. Baldwin Brown. We well remember the interest with which we read his first published work, "The Divine Life in Man," several years ago, and also his smaller work, "The Divine Father-

hood in relation to the Atonement." The latter, our readers will remember, is a reply to some strictures passed upon certain portions of the larger publication. We were at the time sorely exercised on some of the subjects discussed by him, and were not a little influenced by his deep and earnest feeling and the originality of his style. But we cannot say that we were satisfied; and at this hour, notwithstanding our deep sympathy with many of his profound views of divine truth, we are less satisfied than ever with some of the theological teachings, especially those concerning Sacrifice and Atonement, of which among many able and earnest men, he is still one of the principal exponents.

The present publication, as may be inferred from its title, has little to do with exposition of doctrines, strictly so called. It is a volume of essays "on the social and ecclesiastical questions, which," the writer says in the preface, "in these days a preacher is bound to study, and on which it is expected that he should have some guidance to offer to the people of his charge." It appears that Mr. Brown recently (little more than twelve months ago), closed a ministry of twenty-four years at Claylands Chapel, and with part of his congregation has taken possession of a new and larger church which they have built in the Brixton Road. The works which the esteemed author has published "have been chiefly discourses on topics of Christian thought and experience," and it occurred to him at this "crisis of his ministry that it might be well to put together some record of his teaching on the social and ecclesiastical questions" aforesaid. The thought on the whole was a happy one, and illustrates the advantage, to an able and conscientious minister, of having under his particular care a sympathetic congregation whom he can regularly instruct and feed, in a manner incompatible with an oft-changing ministry. We can afford to say this, because we believe that on the whole the advantage is on the side of an itinerating ministry, such as exists in Methodism; but in Mr. Brown's position, the idea, we say, was a good one, and the result is a volume which, whether it adds to the already extensive and well earned reputation of the author or not, is well worth an attentive perusal by such as take an interest in many of the prominent questions of the times.

The first part of the work is on "The Doctrine of the Infallible,"—a subject which has been thrust into the very foreground of the ecclesiastical questions of our day by the Papal definition of the dogma at Rome. It is altogether a marvellous and monstrous thing that there should be found

a human being arrogant enough to pretend to be able to give an infallible answer, in every possible case, to the question, "What is truth?" The inquiry breaks out in a myriad tongues, and relates to all subjects,—religion and science, society and politics; but it is now affirmed, and the affirmation is accepted by millions of Catholics, learned as well as unlearned, that the Pope is able to resolve all difficulties and to declare with the infallibility of God what is true and what is false, in all the momentous and multitudinous questions that force themselves upon the attention of mankind; henceforth then all controversy must cease. Controversy, indeed, is unnecessary, and if persisted in becomes manifest impiety, as doubting the existence of an authoritative voice. Such a pretension, we say, is simply marvellous, and only less so than that any given number of human beings should have been found capable of investing in a formal manner, by voice and vote, a frail old man with an attribute which can belong only to God We say nothing of the logic of the papal definition, which under the circumstances is hardly worth mentioning, but the impiety of it is awful.

Yet there is a doctrine of the infallible which is true, or else we are driven to the alternative, that God has placed us in a world which is full of mystery, without having done anything to dispel the shadows, clouds, and darkness which hang about our path. This is the burden of Mr. Brown's first lecture on "What is Truth?"

It is a standing, and, we believe, a conclusive argument for the necessity of a Divine Revelation, that without it man possesses neither a standard of morals nor a rule of faith. He knows not, for certain, what he ought either to believe or do; and yet the necessity is every day laid upon him both of believing and doing. Under such circumstances the questions, "What is Truth?" "What is Duty?" are of vital importance, and press for a definite answer with all the eagerness and importunity of a spirit conscious of having an immortal destiny before it. But let us present our readers with some words of Mr. Brown, himself. "The present subject," viz., that involved in the inquiry, "What is Truth?"—"is man's sense of his need, under all conditions and in all ages, of an infallible guidance—a knowledge of truth and duty which he can accept as final—on which he can rest as on a rock, as he goes about his heaven-appointed work." "The need arises mainly out of his sense of the awful magnitude and perplexity of the problems of life; awful, I say, for so they have seemed to all people and to all souls who have looked the conditions

of man's life fairly in the face." "We speak with admiration of the heroism of the soldier—cool, calm, persistent, with death raging all round him, and the life draining from its springs. We are caught chiefly by what we *see;* visible conflict, endurance, conquest of suffering, on the battle field, strike us strongly; we can see it clearly before the mind's eye, even when we read about it; it stirs the blood and fires the eye:"—"But the true hero of the world is the thinker, agonising day after day, year after year, to solve the problem of life's mystery; searching wearily, painfully, in the region of the unknown for some slight hints of truth or signs of God. Baffled, beaten, yet ever renewing his quest; each one taking up the problem where his forerunner had left it, catching the torch from the failing grasp of the exhausted athlete, and bearing it on with new born ardour, till, spent himself, at length, he passes it on as he drops, to a younger and stronger hand."

Such—and the picture is scarcely overdrawn—is the nature and need of the soul's quest after truth; and it is not conceivable that a God of truth and love should withhold the answer required, the only question being, "How does the oracle speak?" "How is the answer given?" Is it through an Infallible Church or an Infallible Book, or how? And these are the questions to which the author addresses himself in some succeeding chapters of his work.

He first discusses the notion of an Infallible Church, which has taken possession of so many minds, with special reference to the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, as defined by the Council of the Vatican.

Mr. Brown always writes in a fair spirit and is an honourable controversialist. Indeed at times he seems to give excess of consideration for his opponents, while to his own side he at times hardly gives consideration enough. With regard to this dogma of infallibility he is extremely anxious to do justice to it, and consider it from the point of view of those who see in it man's only sure guide out of the wilderness of doubt and mystery in which he finds himself. He believes, and in this we agree with him, that there is now, and always has been, Infallibility in the Church, just because the God of truth has always been with, and in, the Church; and he is willing to believe that this fact lies at the root of that idea of infallibility which existed in the Church for ages, and at length developed into a dogma at Rome. He says—"But the idea that there was infallibility somewhere was very strongly entertained through all these ages," down even to the sixth century, before which the dogma was not entertained, certainly not adopted at Rome.

"Men believed that certainty was attainable through some decisive dogmatic utterance of the mind of the spirit; and there can be no doubt that the celebrated dictum of St. Vincent of Lerins, who wrote in the first half of the fifth century on the means of determining the true christian doctrine, expresses the idea to which the mind of Christendom had at that time attained. *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,* is his criterion. It is the formula of the infallibility of the church, the whole body of the faithful at any time existing in the world. And there is something in this idea which is not without its truth." "It rests on the explicit and most precious assurance of Christ. 'Lo, I am with you always.' 'Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things.' 'Howbeit, when He the spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth.' There abides in the church, and in all true christian hearts, a profound belief that His in-dwelling spirit is maintaining the truth in the believer and in the community; and that if the essence of the belief of the whole body of the faithful in whom the spirit dwells could in any age be expressed, it is the truth as in Jesus which would be disclosed. And so far we can recognise a truth in the idea and rejoice in it. The faith cannot perish out of the whole Catholic Church."

There is no need to dwell upon such statements as these, with which there will be general agreement. And, supposing the doctrine of the infallibility of the church to be based upon a truth as above stated, if the Church of Rome had been content with this view of the doctrine without compressing it into a dogma of the Jesuits, she would not now have been placed in the unenviable position of hostility to the culture and intelligence and science of Christendom. But this is precisely what Rome could not do. The fine rich doctrine that there is infallible truth in the church, meaning all the faithful in Christ Jesus, is too vague and indefinite for manipulation by Jesuit hands for Jesuit purposes. Hence the Roman Catholic Church is, according to Romanists, the sole Church of Christ on earth; none are the faithful but those within her fold, and the Church of Rome is alone the Infallible Church. Still this is not enough; and the vague and intangible thing, infallibility of the church, is gathered up and made definite. A truth at first pure is perverted and corrupted, and finally brought to a head in the blasphemous dogma of the infallibility of the Pope.

But whilst Mr. Brown tries to find a basis of truth for the doctrine of infallibility, he is most vigorous in his denunciation

against the full blown Papal dogma. He traces it directly to the Jesuits as its authors, and can feel little respect for the Pope who has become the willing instrument of their machinations. He regards it as a deadly blow—as deadly as any the papacy can strike—at the liberties and enlightenments of mankind. "It is impossible," he says, "not to connect the council with that dark and resolute opposition to what are called modern ideas, which has inspired the influence of the society of Jesus on the Church and on the world since the era of its establishment. In truth it is their *raison d'etre*. Their influence on the deliberations which led to the summoning of the council, or its objects, and on the conduct of its business, is acknowledged on all hands to have been supreme. It is distinctly their movement, and we must believe that its object is the establishment of their ideas. We are tempted to smile at the garrulous and obstinate old man, who seems now, by claiming Divine attributes, to be putting himself, in such days as these, to an open shame. It seems almost like an act of that madness which precedes perdition."

The author does not, therefore, find the answer to the inquiry "What is truth?" in the modern notion of an Infallible Church. The Pope may arrogate to himself the prerogatives of a special Divine Providence, and presume to prescribe what is every man's duty down to the minutest particulars of his mundane career, but it will be all in vain. Time is not to be put backward at the bidding of a vain old man; and we shall have to look elsewhere than to Rome for that infallible guidance which we all so ardently long for. If it is not an Infallible Church, is it to be found in an Infallible Book?

This is the question next discussed by Mr. Brown; and we may remark at once that some parts of his extended answer will be read with different feelings by different persons. We have spoken of the author's desire to do justice to the views of his opponents; but he does not always display an equal desire to conciliate his friends. He too often, we think, takes opportunity to have a fling at some of our old and deeply cherished sentiments, in fact it seems almost to be a habit with him. In his chapter on "The Infallible Book" these are some of the sentences in the first paragraph, beginning with the opening sentence.

"'The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants,' is a sentence which we Protestants constantly quote to our glory, with eulogies of the 'immortal Chillingworth,' more or less judicious. It is, perhaps, the most popular commonplace of our religious platforms, and it is supposed to set forth

the central point of our Protestant creed with singular point and power. It is a sentence which the Romanists as constantly quote to our shame. And so far the Romanists are right. They have set up an infallible church as their idol, and after the fashion of all idolatries it is gradually debasing itself." "We, on the other hand, have set up an Infallible Book as the object of our idolatry," and we suppose this idolatry, too, will gradually debase itself, leading us into an abject reverence for the mere letters of the Bible. "We have handled its texts," says the author, "and its very letters, after a fashion, which has denied the inward teaching of the living spirit, if it has not involved a doubt of the existence of a spirit is now capable of being taught by Him, while it has hidden from us as it did from the Pharisees, the living person of the living Lord." Now it is probably good for us to have a "candid friend" at our elbow now and then; but, although we have no desire to regard our present author as a "candid friend" in any but the best sense, we cannot suppress the wish that he would be at least as merciful to his friends as he is to his foes. We think we understand Mr. Brown, and can appreciate his feeling in part; but in spite of all the horror expressed in certain quarters, of what is sinisterly called Bibliolatry, we fear that the worship of the Bible is not a very wide-spread superstition; The Book is far more neglected than adored.

The position of the author with regard to the Bible is contained in these words, which are his own, "The Revelation of God is in the Bible; this is the Christian creed." In some sentences previous to this one we have the following, "We have had a good deal of fierce controversy about the Bible of late, and no satisfactory account has yet been given of the nature and measure of its inspiration. Perhaps it is not in the nature of things that an entirely satisfactory account should be given. But most thoughtful people, I imagine, have arrived at the conclusion that it is a book whose various portions were written under very various conditions, and contains in very various measures the direct communications of God to man. The Gospel of St. John, the Epistle to the Romans, the Book of Judges, the Book of Esther, the cursing Psalms, and the Epistle of St. Jude, contain, as I imagine most thoughtful persons are prepared to allow, very different measures of inspiration, if, indeed, in the case of some of them you can speak of inspiration at all, except from a passionate human spring." The author's belief is that there are things in the Bible which were not inspired by God. He does not believe that the "sun and moon and the whole system of the universe stood still,

that Israel might take its fill of slaughter." He does not believe that "some of the most ruthless and savage commands to exterminate whole peoples, by way of revenge for ancient hostility, came forth by direct inspiration from Him who came into this world not to destroy men's lives but to save them." He feels "bound to believe that Samuel, in that terrible commission of slaughter, mistook patriotic passion for Divine fire." On the other hand, he sees no reason why disbelief of these things, should interfere with our belief of other things of a different kind in the same book. Disbelief of the above is no reason why we should not believe that, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth;" and, "God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us;" and to do otherwise seems to him "rank idolatry of the Word, and makes a claim on its behalf which it never urges for itself."

If we admit these positions of the author, the difficulty at once starts up, how we are to know where to stop? and who is to tell us what part of the Bible is God's Word and what is not. It is not to be supposed that these narratives of the Old Testament are the only portions to which exception may be taken by one or another, and the process having begun, where is it to end? We have no desire to deny or underrate the difficulties of the subject, but for our own part, accepting our present canon, and believing as Mr. Brown does, that though it "was left to be formed by human judgment," the judgment was "not unguided surely," we would rather accept the Book with its difficulties than resort to the dangerous practice of excision in order to get rid of them. Disbelief in the inspiration of one part of the Bible will not, we fear, strengthen our belief in the inspiration of the other parts; but it will probably diminish our belief in the inspiration of the whole.

According to the author there is infallible truth in the written word, but it is not "an infallible receipt book for all difficulties and perplexities," and is therefore not an infallible guide for those who are asking for infallible guidance according to the modern idea. There is infallibility in the church at large, but it is truth held in solution. This the Vatican Council has condensed into a dogma and lodged it in the person of his holiness the Pope; and now Papal infallibility means the blasphemous pretension of being able to declare with unerring truth

what we are to believe and what we are to do in every difficulty and perplexity of life. There is no such infallibility as this, Mr. Brown says, in the Bible, and therefore it is not an infallible guide to those who "persist in treating the Book as a code of infallible precepts for the conduct of life," and will not answer the purposes of those who want to get rid of the responsibility of using their own intelligence and will, which probably explains much of the earnest longing for an infallible guide.

Passing away from the infallible church and the infallible book, the author proceeds to what he calls "The Doctrine of Christ," as supplying the true answer to the inquiry "What is Truth?" We cannot say we care much for the chapter, and it is not easy to say in a few words exactly what the author's position is; but we think it amounts to this: There is infallible truth in the Bible, but we have no earthly infallible interpreter. But we have the promise of a celestial guide, who will lead us into all truth. He believes that there is a continuous revelation of truth to the spirit of man by the Spirit of God. He says that the Romanists complain of us Protestants, that we "Have no room for the continual revelation of the mind of God to the Church through the Spirit, whose special function it is, according to the promise, to guide us into all truth. They hold that the revelation of God must be a continuous revelation, with power of adaptation to her conditions and needs, and he says it can "hardly be denied that there is much truth in these representations." Well, if he means that the Holy Spirit dwelling in the hearts of God's children will enable them the better to understand the written word, and that He will instruct them more and more in those thoughts of God which are "very deep," we are glad to recognise the truth. But we have no belief that the Holy Ghost will communicate to man any fresh revelation of the will of God as an addition to what He has already made known in His word. That there is much in that word for us yet to learn, and that it is the gracious office of the spirit to "guide" us into the truth, is what we humbly and gratefully believe; but we do not believe that the Spirit will reveal aught to the human heart that is not involved in the Divine Word.

There is then such a thing as infallible truth in the world. There is infallible truth in the Bible; and in all that concerns man's highest interests—the way to pardon, peace, and holiness here, and blessedness hereafter,—we believe it to be an infallible guide. But it must be read with intelligence; it must be read prayerfully for the teaching of that Spirit by

whom its pages were originally inspired; and then, as far probably as is possible to us, with our present faculties, it will reveal to us the will of God. But here are some rather startling words. Mr. Brown says "Age to age reiterates the inquiry 'What is Truth' with more or less of passionate eagerness, and the cry seems to rise loudest, clearest, most importunate from the heart of that Christendom, which is founded on the express revelation of the mind of the God of Truth to the world. Keen as has been the cry of the unsatisfied human heart through all the ages of heathen darkness, the question, What is Truth? has been heard with far sharper and more bitter emphasis from lands and from ages in which is shining as with meridian splendour 'the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,'—so little is truth a thing which, by a mere act of revelation, the mere shining forth of a light can be given to mankind." We think this not a little bewildering to simple, truthful souls. No doubt there has been much wrangling about human interpretations of Divine truth, but we suspect if men were more anxious to know the will of God in matters that immediately concern them than to uphold their own special theories about what may concern them, after all, but very remotely, there would be less complaint than there is of the ambiguity and uncertainty of the teachings of the Sacred Word. There is a passage of the New Testament which is frequently quoted by writers like Mr. Brown, and always with approbation. "He that will do (or is willing to do) His will, shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." The author before us, indeed, gives what is probably a true sense of the passage—"If any man will do His will, he is in the way of knowing the doctrine of all things else in time." This we believe. Obedience, *in the spiritual sphere*, as he would say, is the true organ of knowledge; and it is not seldom that the Divine Teacher reveals to the spirit of the lowly and contrite in heart what he withholds from the intellect of those who, after all that He has done and all that He has taught, are evermore reiterating the cry, "What is Truth?" with frantic feverish excitement, just as if Christ, the Truth, had never been in the world at all.

The other sections of Mr. Brown's work comprise essays on "The Natural History of Anti-Christ," "The Christian Commonwealth," and "The Revolution of the last Quarter of a Century." As to the first we can only say it is not much to our taste; but the last one contains some admirable disquisitions on the intellectual, social, ecclesiastical, and theological changes which have taken place during the last twenty-five years.

We append a quotation from the chapter on "The Intellectual Revolution," without endorsing all it contains. Referring to M. Comte's views of God, as expressed in certain parts of his *Cours de Philosophic Positive,* Mr. Brown asks—

"Where did he get this idea of God, this capricious, meddling Deity? I answer unhesitatingly, from the theology of the Church. Consider the position which all theologians have occupied towards science from the day when science began to be. Is there a single great principle which science has established on its own indisputable basis which the theologians have not at once denounced as impious, on the ground of their own superior knowledge of the plan of Creation and of the ideas of God? The notion in the theological mind has been that in the Bible God had furnished man, not so much with a means of a living and fruitful knowledge of Himself, but rather with a complete ground-plan of the Creation, which justified them, the experts of the theological schools, in at once pronouncing authoritative judgment on the truth of the doctrines of science, and even on the facts on which they were supposed to rest. The idea of the movement of the earth they resisted with fierce and passionate determination; they did not hesitate to employ bonds and stripes on its advocates. . . . . And we must remember that those theologians, while branding the Copernican doctrine as impious, were believing themselves, and teaching others to believe, a whole host of most idle and childish tales of miraculous interventions on behalf of their adored saints; the suspension of the most settled laws of nature for the most foolish or contemptible of objects—to get a saint across a river, to enable him to fly over a mountain. . . . . But then it may be said there is an intelligent as well as a perverse view of the Bible in its relation to science. *We* do not fight against scientific demonstrations with theological weapons, some of us may say. We look on the Bible as mainly a revelation of spiritual truth, and surely there is a possible harmony between a sound scientific philosophy and such a spirit as this. Most surely; and it will appear in time, but not yet. . . . . How far is it believed in England at this moment, by the great majority of our theologians, that once the whole system of the universe (for our sun cannot be detached from the most distant worlds) paused in its motion, stood still in the midst of the heavens, that a people chosen by Providence for a high destiny might take a tremendous vengeance on their foes? Some can see that the marvellous passage which records it is a poetical fragment, perhaps, of some heroic song, and that it expresses its vivid poetical language the remembrance which the people cherished of some remarkable atmospheric phenomenon, which they connected in their minds with a long, stern, and to them glorious day's work. But there are millions of theological minds in England at this moment which would shrink with horror from such an explanation, and insist on the literal truth

of a miracle, whose tremendous disproportion, from a moral point of view, fills us with amazement that it should ever have been cast as a stumbling block in the philosopher's path."—Pp. 240-3.

Perhaps some of our readers may take exception to these latter views, however readily they may subscribe to the former. But we beg them, nevertheless, not to charge Mr. Brown with heresy, for he believes that "miracle remains an essential element of the Christian system;" and, doubtless, it is a benefit to have matters put thus freshly and vividly before us, even though we refuse credence to all that is presented by our teacher.

H. L. T.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Introductory Lectures on the Study of Christian Theology, with Outlines of Lectures on the Doctrines of Christianity: By the late Rev. JOHN HANNAH, D.D., to which is prefixed a Memoir of the Rev. John Hannah, D.D., by the Rev. W. B. Pope. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872.

THIS is a book which most Methodist ministers will take to their heart. Mr. Pope's memoir of Dr. Hannah is most excellently done. Indeed, it constitutes the main charm of the work, and is, we think, its most instructive portion. The Outlines of Lectures are valuable because they inform us how for the last thirty or forty years Wesleyan ministers have been trained for their work.

In some respects these lectures cannot be considered as up to the times. His biographer states—"It was his intention to give the whole course of his Lectures to the world. But, while pondering thus year after year, the foundations of systematic theology were shifting; Christian Evidences were undergoing what amounted to a revolution; Biblical Criticism was beginning afresh; and the introduction to the Bible was almost re-written. It was impossible to any but a very agile as well as learned writer on theology to keep pace at all points; and so it was that the projected revision was not begun until the end of life. The present volume contains the doctrinal portion of the course as it was left by the author, only the earlier Lectures have been re-written." Still it is justifiable to speak of them as valuable contributions to theology, and it would have been a loss to Methodism to have withheld them from the public.

The Treasury of David; containing an original exposition of the Book of Psalms; a collection of illustrative extracts from the whole range of literature; a series of Homiletical Hints upon almost every verse; and lists of writers upon each Psalm. By C. H. SPURGEON. Vol. III. London: Passmore and Alabaster, 1872.

WE have already described the character and given our opinion of this work. To repeat our commendation is not necessary. To the spiritually minded it cannot but be a feast of fat things. Happy they who have relish for such a feast; and happy they who have such a feast on which to regale their spiritual appetites.

How to Pray, and what to Pray for: an exposition of the Lord's Prayer and Christ's introductory sayings. By E. J. ROBINSON. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872.

ON the score of taste we might here and there find a little fault with this book, but it is marked by substantial excellencies which far outweigh any defects we could name. Its nineteen chapters cannot surely be read without leading us to use the Lord's Prayer more intelligently, more devoutly, and more appreciatively. The chapter on "Using a Form" contains some remarks which we commend to the consideration of such as demur to the use of a liturgy in public worship, though we know the power of prejudice can neutralize the most conclusive reasoning. For the sake of such as do not know how to "say" the prayer our Lord taught His disciples—and their name is legion—we transcribe the following:—

"Worshippers are often baulked when the Lord's Prayer is repeated in religious meetings, by unexpected turns in phraseology, not all of them such as might innocently be adopted in private devotion, and some of them not agreeing with the prayer as recorded by the Evangelists. We will specify a few of these aberrations with which we are painfully familiar. Fixing the thought less on the heavenly fatherhood and more on the person and abode of the Divine Being, the schoolmaster says, 'Our Father *who* art in heaven.' Seeming to disjoint the throne on which we have been wont to gaze, another of his corrections is, 'Thine *are* the kingdom, the power, and the glory.' The skill of the rhetorician is combined with the teachers in the travesty, 'For Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory are Thine; both now and for ever.' An improvement which distributes the worshippers who were as a family around God's footstool, takes the heart and homeliness of the petition away, and reminds one of the Pharisee's prayer in the temple, is agreed to by the natural philosopher and unnatural critic—'Thy will be done *on* earth.' Many superfluously say, 'As it is *done* in heaven.' The theologian, spreading himself, but wanting wing, thus amplifies while he flutters, 'Forgive us our trespasses, *and grant us that we may* forgive them that trespass against us,' or more briefly, '*that we may forgive;*' or, '*as we would* forgive our debtors.' Another correction of the free-thinking divine is, 'Give us *each* day our daily bread.' The pious rationalist, weighing the successive sentences, pronounces that, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' is a very suitable petition for the early morning, but of whatever meaning the language is susceptible, and although the Jewish day commenced at sunset, a ridiculous petition in the evening. Men supply the public-house with fellow victims, and drive animals to the slaughter, he says, but God would certainly keep us out of the reach of temptation; and he therefore thus perverts the sixth petition, '*Leave* us not *in* temptation.' Others alter thus, 'Lead us *into no* temptation, but deliver us from *all that is* evil.' The danger in such changes is that of 'adding unto' or 'taking away from the words' of the Lord. We must observe what the written language is, ascertain with what signification it was given, and employ it with the original meaning and intended application. Christ knew what was best for us to say; and it becomes us, as nearly as possible, to use the very words He commanded, and all of us, for harmony's sake, to have them in one English dress."

The Mission of the Spirit; or, the office and work of the Comforter in Human Redemption. By the Rev. L. R. DUNN, Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S. Edited by the Rev. JOSEPH BUSH. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872.

THIS is not a theological treatise, but a series of plain, warm-hearted sermons, well adapted to be useful to the reader. The Wesleyan Book Committee has done well to republish them in this country, for they will serve to call the attention of both ministers and people to truths respecting the office and work of the Holy Spirit, which we fear are too much overlooked at the present day.

The Methodist Memorial, &c. By CHARLES ATMORE. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co., 1871.

THIS is a new and cheap edition of a work first published in 1801. The lapse of seventy years since its publication has tended to make it rare and valuable. It contains sketches of the lives of more than two hundred ministers, and so gives us a pretty full view of Methodism in the last century. The author evidently abides by his decision to give his sketches impartially, and thereby he has added to the usefulness of his work. We are thankful for the re-publication as a contribution to Methodistic history, and hope the sale of the work will be remunerative to its publishers.

Heavenly Laws for Earthly Homes: being a manual of the relative duties. By ED. DENNETT. London: Elliot Stock, 1872.

THE object of this little book is excellent. The author designs it to be a contribution towards the furtherance of domestic peace and happiness. And his design will be answered, if the various members of the family will only read and observe the Christian counsels here addressed to them. We wish for this manual of the relative duties a wide circulation.

"Loving Work for Christ." Memoirs of Mrs. Gibson, late of Newcastle-on-Tyne, including selections from her correspondent. By F. A. WEST. A new edition abridged and revised by J. V. B. Shrewsbury. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1872.

To our lady readers, whether maidens, wives, or mothers, we specially commend this little volume. It is not a sensational biography, the

subject of it moved in comparatively private life, and her history furnishes little incident. But, as her biographer observes, the example exhibited embodies those duties which are the substantial business of life, and the imitation of it is all the more practicable on account of the sphere in which the giver of it moved.

Authentic Report of the Discussion held in Rome, on February 9th and 10th, 1872, between Catholic Priests and Evangelical Ministers, concerning the Coming of St. Peter to Rome. Translated by W. ARTHUR, A.M. London: Wesleyan Conference Office.

THE discussion here reported is indeed a sign of the times. Who could have predicted such an event only a very few years ago without being ridiculed for his extravagance? But it has transpired, and in a way that adds to its significance and importance. The discussion was conducted in an orderly and courteous manner, the press of Italy took it up with gravity and intelligent interest, while, on the other side, the Pope appointed a *triduum*, or holy day of three successive days, for a ceremonial in St. Peter's, with a view to "offer reparation for the horrible blasphemies with which, in these latter days, infidels have denied the presence and death of St. Peter in Rome."

As the Report is issued in a cheap form its purchase is within the reach of all.

The Papal Garrison. London: W. Hunt & Company. 1872.

THE title of this pamphlet will indicate to most of our readers its character and object, especially when they learn that it is dedicated to the Marquis of Salisbury. That there is a Papal garrison planted in our country we fully believe, and, also, that it has gone on gathering strength and multiplying its outposts, until it has become not only a conspicuous feature, but a formidable power in this commonwealth, and that portentous perils accrue to our liberties thereby. With this belief we regard with satisfaction the publication of such pamphlets as that before us, though on many political points we differ entirely from the writer.

The Methodist Pulpit. No. VII. *Zeal for Good Works.* A Sermon, by the REV. C. GARRETT. With Portrait. Price One Penny.

THIS sermon is in Mr. Garrett's usual practical and effective style, and will be read with pleasure by his many admirers.

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY,

SEPTEMBER, 1872.

ART. I.—JESUS AND THE COMMON PEOPLE.

THE statement of the Evangelist Mark that the common people heard our Lord gladly applies beyond the occasion of which it was spoken. It may be said of the greater part of His ministry. As He went into the cities and villages of Palestine, teaching and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, with a few exceptions, it is correct that the common people heard Him gladly.

But who were the common people referred to by the Evangelist? The expression is generally understood to intend an antithesis to the higher classes of society, and so to mark the social position and temporal circumstances of the persons described. But this idea must be discarded. The common people are not necessarily the low, the vulgar, the depraved, or even the impoverished. The real antithesis of the expression is of the many to the few; and the Evangelist simply means to tell us that the crowd, the multitude, the great body of the people heard Him gladly. Still the fact sought by some to be intimated by their use of this expression comes to us in another form. The common people, the people who constitute the great bulk of society, necessarily belong to the industrial or working classes. They are the tillers of the ground, artificers and mechanics; or they are under the authority of those who are in positions of power and affluence.

Generally it has fallen to the lot of a select and privileged class to rule or govern, while the common people have to be subject to the higher powers. They are the few only who possess the means to live at home at ease, to clothe themselves in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day; the common people have to earn their bread by the sweat of their face, working with their hands or their brains that they may

secure for themselves and dependents the necessaries and comforts of life. By the very necessities of their condition, therefore, the character of the common people cannot be uniformly that of great refinement and culture, nor their circumstances those of abundance and ease.

That with the common people in Palestine Jesus Christ was, on the whole, a favourite admits of no question or doubt. They *heard* Him, and they heard Him *gladly*, with keen relish and delight. He was pre-eminently a popular teacher. He spoke to the people, and gained their attention, and won their esteem. As He taught He was glorified of all. All the people were attentive to hear Him. All the people came early in the morning to hear Him, so that from the envious Pharisees was extorted the confession, the world is gone after Him.

Nor were the people so fickle in their admiration of Jesus as some would have us suppose. The multitude, indeed, clamoured for the death of Him with whose teachings they had once been so charmed, and solicited that Barabbas, a murderer, should be saved from crucifixion rather than He. Still they did not this of their own free will, they were persuaded to it by the chief priests and elders, who for some time were deterred from carrying their murderous designs into effect because they feared the people. They specially counselled that He should not be taken on the feast lest there be an uproar of the people.

The object of this brief essay is to account for this attachment of the people to Jesus—to show what were the elements of His ministry which rendered it so popular. Nor is the subject without its practical uses. It may have an application to our own times and circumstances, for to the ministers and Churches of the present day and in our own land the popularity of our Lord's ministry, rightly understood, may minister some important lessons.

The fact we seek to investigate and expose, that is the acceptability of our Lord's ministry with the multitude, may be traced to several causes. These causes may be summed up and discussed under two heads—Sympathy and Power—and this method of treating the subject we shall adopt.

Sympathy with the common people was one cause of Christ's popularity with them. They heard Him gladly because on many points they found Him in affinity with themselves. The points referred to may be classified as political and ecclesiastical, social and human.

To understand the two first-named it may be necessary to glance at the character and condition of the commonality of

the Jewish nation when Jesus exercised His ministry amongst them. The nation itself was then, if not in the article of death, yet, rapidly approaching dissolution. The Romans had invaded the land and subdued the people, and their rule was most afflictive. The sceptre had fallen from Judah's grasp, and was seized and wielded by a people who governed with remorseless cruelty and avarice. Not only had the Jews the humiliation of having to pay their taxes into the exchequer of invaders and usurpers, but the taxes were farmed out to court favourites, who, to augment their own fortunes, as well as maintain the imperial revenues were most exorbitant in their exactions. Of course this was resented, frequently resented by bloody insurrection, which was readily suppressed by the Romans with incredible slaughter. The state of public feeling in these circumstances it is not difficult to conjecture. The common people were exasperated, the iron entered into their soul, and they longed and sighed for a deliverer from their vassalage.

But whence should a deliverer come to them?

From their Scribes and Elders, those who should be their Leaders and Protectors, all patriotism had departed. They had accepted the inevitable, and were servilely submissive to the sway of the Romans. But while this was their phase of character toward the foreign power now dominant in their midst, toward their own country-men—their own kinsfolk after the flesh—they manifested great hardness of heart and intolerant arrogance. Their hierarchical teachers, especially, were harsh and austere in their exactions. They laid upon them heavy burdens which they would not touch with their little fingers. These ecclesiastics too were sanctimonious oppressors, who of all kinds of oppressors are the most destestable. To the weak and defenceless they were remorselessly rapacious, they devoured widows' houses, and then for a pretence made long and frequent prayers. Against those classes of society our Lord directed His teaching. He exposed and denounced them, and that not with bated breath, or in language which obscured and softened his indignation, but in terms and with an earnestness which burnt and scathed them. They were a generation of vipers which should not escape the damnation of hell. "Woe be unto you" was the burden of His cry concerning them.

We cite an illustrative instance. "And He said unto them in His doctrine, Beware of the Scribes, which love to go in long clothing, and love salutations in the market places, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms

at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers; these shall receive greater damnation." The contiguity of the statement that the common people heard Him gladly with this passage warrants us in saying that the exposure and denunciation by Christ of those who despised and oppressed the people was one ground of His popularity. The effect was further heightened by the hope or expectation which they had begun to entertain—though they had no warrant for it except as the wish might be father to the thought—that perhaps He who could reprove so sternly, and denounce with such authority, was destined to be their political deliverer. Even the disciples shared in this expectation, and it was not killed within them till they saw their Master actually crucified. "We trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel." While the expectation seems to have revived with His resurrection: "When they were come together they asked of Him, saying, Lord wilt Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"

The other points in which the common people found Jesus in affinity with themselves we have spoken of as social and human.

He did not belong to the wealthy, the privileged, or ruling classes. He was not an ecclesiastic, a member of the Jewish hierarchy at all. He belonged to the people. He was one of themselves. He was identified with them by birth, by occupation, and by temporal condition. But not only in these respects did He stand on the same plane as they did, He was one with them in spirit. He understood them, and in all their varied experience He was their fellow. Illustrations and proofs of this will crowd upon the memory of all who are familiar with the records of the four Evangelists.

He was not only in His public teachings the advocate and defender of the people against those who oppressed and preyed upon them in their helplessness, but in His personal deportment toward themselves He showed that in their afflictions He was afflicted, that as far as sympathy enabled Him He bare their infirmities and carried their sorrows. "When He saw the multitude, He was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd." The style of His teaching and the character of His intercourse with them were all expressive of this compassion. He was without hateur. About His manner their was no vain pomposity nor repulsive coldness. His conduct could never bear the construction that He considered it a lowering of Himself—an act of great and com-

mendable condescension on His part—to give attention to those who sought an interview with Him, or to mingle in their society. Humility and kindness were exemplified in all He did, and in all He said. Grace was poured into His lips. He was meek and lowly in heart.

Now this told upon the people; and the effect was heightened by contrast. How different was the spirit and demeanour of their recognised teachers. They loved to go in long clothing, to wear robes such as princes of rank were accustomed to wear. They craved for and were delighted with salutations in the Market places,—the places of public resort, and where the people promenaded. They were gratified by being called Rabbi, and at seeing the people bowing before them in obeisance. They, too, must have the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms, or places of honour, at feasts. Deference, obsequiousness, and servility was what they exacted from all who approached them; but Christ received the people graciously. He dwelt among them, a man with men. This certainly tended to win the hearts of the common people. It awakened their admiration and gained their love. Never man spake like this man. He spake as one having authority, and not as the Scribes.

But the people heard Jesus gladly for what He said as well as for the spirit and manner in which he said it. They were astonished at *His doctrine:* not merely at the masterly reasoning with which He confuted His opponents, and the severity with which He denounced wrong doers in high places, but at the direct and positive truths which He taught. Now what were those truths? To what did they relate, and by what character were they distinguished? Every reader of the Gospels knows they were not political nor secular; of these elements they were altogether devoid. No political harangue, no scientific lecture, no social or economical disquisition, did Jesus ever address to the people. His themes were of another character altogether. They related to man, but to man in his higher interests, to man as he stood in relation to God, and the great and mysterious future which lay before him. He revealed God, and He brought life and immortality to light. His doctrine, propounded and understood, did not exhibit man as a mere creature of time, and solely an inhabitant of the present world. Though he partook of physical appetites and passions yet he was not a mere animal; he was better than a sheep; worth more than the fowls. Though his condition in this world brought with it the inexorable necessity that he must work if he would eat,

yet to labour for the bread that perishes was not the whole duty of man. Though uncertainty as to the timely and adequate supply of his bodily wants seemed stamped upon his earthly lot, he was not to allow all his anxieties to be absorbed in inquiries as to what he should eat and drink and wear. The world of sense was not the only world in which he lived. He stood related to things unseen as well as seen, to things spiritual as well as secular, to things eternal as well as temporal. He had therefore other needs than physical ones to be supplied, other anxieties than those about food and raiment to be relieved. In the body which had the affections of hunger and thirst, which could suffer pain, which could be paralysed with disease, which could be destroyed by death, there was another being enshrined, man's true being, the soul which had an affinity with God, bore His image, partook of His nature, the soul which was of priceless worth, could not be killed but might be cast into hell, therefore lost, a catastrophe for which nothing could compensate, for what should it profit a man if he gained the whole world and lost his soul, or what could a man give in exchange for his soul. But this catastrophe was not inevitable. It might be escaped, and a brighter destiny secured. The boon of eternal life was placed within the reach of every man. A life of purity and blessedness in the presence of God, and an endless life of this character and thus enjoyed, was his true destiny. Men, therefore, must look up to God as their Father, they were His offspring, and He had a father's care and love for them. He cared for their bodies, knew what things they had need of, and would feed and clothe them as surely as He fed the fowls and beautified the flowers. He cared for their souls and would forgive them their sins, and help them in their weakness, and succour them in their trials, if they sought His help and blessing.

And then their common relation to God had an important bearing on their relation to each other. They were brethren not merely as Abraham's descendents, but as children of their one Father in heaven; and they were to live together as brethren, being to each other as such what God their heavenly Father was to them all. Selfishness, vindictiveness, and revenge were to disappear from among them. They were to be poor in spirit, to mourn over their sinfulness, to be meek, merciful, and promoters of concord. Yea, they were to rise to a higher ethical character than all this implies; "I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you: that ye may be the children of your

Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."

This outline is sufficient to indicate the character of Christ's *doctrine*—the truths He taught the people, and the subjects to which those truths related. And when we remember what was the teaching of the Scribes, and how Christ's doctrine contrasted with that, need we be surprised that the people should listen to Him with mingled wonder and joy. Rabinical lore compared with the docrine of Jesus was as the chaff to the wheat. There was nothing in it to meet either the demands of a manly intelligence, or the cravings of an enlightened conscience. There was a quibbling about the letter of Scripture, and an obscuring and perverting of its meaning, which could not minister to the instruction of any rational being. And then traditions were expounded and enforced which brought the whole life in slavery to form and ceremony. Indeed by the prevalence of such teaching the knowledge of God had faded amongst the Jews, and except with a favoured few spiritual religion was unknown. But under the teaching of Jesus men's hearts were made bare. They awoke to a state of self-consciousness, and while they were convinced of sin, there came the balm of forgiveness with that conviction, the whole quickening them to a hitherto unknown experience, that of hungering and thirsting after righteousness.

This introduces to us the second element of Christ's popularity—Power. He spake as one having authority. Not the authority of office, or hierarchical position, for He was without that. But His word came with power—it told upon the people—and because of this energy which attended His discourses the common people heard Him gladly. He was a popular teacher because he taught with effect.

The power of Christ's teachings had a threefold source. It arose from His person, the spirit with which the truths He enunciated were inspired, and His works.

The person of Christ undoubtedly gave effect to His words. Our readers will know that there is no authentic portrait of Christ, nor can we find any description of His physical appearance in the Gospels. Isaiah, speaking of the Messiah says, "He has no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see Him there is no beauty that we should desire Him." From this some have inferred that our Lord was uncomely and insignificant in His appearance. But the Psalmist speaks of Him in in different language: "Thou art fairer than the children of men; grace is poured into Thy lips; therefore God hath

blessed Thee for ever. Gird Thy sword upon Thy thigh, O most mighty, with Thy glory, and Thy majesty." From this it has been inferred that our Lord had that dignity and beauty which became as we imagine so exalted a person. Which inference is correct we cannot say, and therefore need not stay to consider.

But when we speak of the power which the person of Jesus gave to His words we do not allude to His physical portraiture—to His height, and form, and features. We refer to His personal bearing and carriage, to the expression of His countenance, the look of His eye, and the action of His hand, to all those particulars which constitute the spiritual in opposition to the physical man, and we are confident that here was no unimportant source of the popularity of Jesus.

Of His *look* we often read in the Evangelists, and sometimes this look was unaccompanied by any vocal utterance. For instance, we read—"And Jesus entered into Jerusalem and into the temple; and when He had looked round about on all things, and now the eventide was come, he went out unto Bethany."

The case of the rich man who came to Christ will clearly indicate our meaning. We are told Jesus beholding him loved him. After he had gone, declining the condition of discipleship proposed, Jesus looked round about as He spake to his disciples on the hindrance furnished by riches to an entrance into the kingdon of Heaven. And as the disciples, astonished out of measure at His words said among themselves, Who then can be saved? their Divine Master again looked upon them as He at once answered their inquiry and calmed their fears by saying, "With men it is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible."

"Our Lord's great power as a speaker," says Ward Beecher, "depended essentially upon the profound truths which He uttered, upon the singular skill with which they were adapted to the peculiar circumstances which called them forth, and to the faculty which he had of uttering in simple and vernacular phrase the most abstruse ideas. But there was besides all this a singular impressiveness of *manner* which it is probable was never surpassed. His attitude, the extraordinary influence of His eye, His very silence, were elements of power of which the Evangelists do not leave us in doubt."*

The inherent energy of the truths Jesus taught is another source of His power. His own declaration comes to our

* Life of Jesus, p. 153.

memory, "The words I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." They were such words because He spoke them, and because they came from His lips imbued with a spirit He only could breathe into them. To say that He was sincere, that He was earnest, that He spoke because He believed, and that His words came from a full conviction He had of their truths and importance, is saying what is true, but it does not cover all the facts of the case.

There have been attempts, as our readers will know, to trace all Christ's teaching, especially the ethical portions of it, the Sermon on the Mount for instance, to Rabinical literature. The attempt has not been successful, but if it had here is a phenomenon which wants explaining,—How truths with which the Jews would be familiar as household words, and which in their original form of presentation had fallen powerless on their minds, should, when coming from the lips of Jesus, have such a quickening effect? For let it be remembered it was at the close of the Sermon on the Mount that the people were astonished at His doctrine—astonished because He taught them as one having authority and not as the Scribes. The phenomenon can only be satisfactorily explained by the narrative given in the fourth of Luke. Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit and taught in the synagogues of Galilee when He was glorified of all. This is His own explication of the fact. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He has anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; He has sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. As He made these utterances the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on Him, and all bare Him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth. Some, however, said in derision, as well as astonishment, Is not this Joseph's son? which led Him to reprove them for their unbelief in such a way that the objects of His reproof were filled with wrath and sought to kill Him. For this purpose they rose up, and thrust Him out of the city, and led Him to the brow of the hill whereon the city was built, with intent to cast Him down headlong. But He freed Himself from their murderous grasp and went to Capernaum, where He renewed His teaching, the people again being astonished at His doctrine; for His word was with power.

This brings us to the third source of His power—His works. Christ's teaching cannot be dissociated from His works. In

the Gospels they almost invariably go together. Luke calls his Gospel a treatise of all that Jesus began to do and teach.

We linger at Capernaum for confirmation of our assertion that the works of Jesus gave effect to His teaching, and led the common people to hear Him gladly. A few sentences ago we left Jesus in the synagogue. "While He was speaking, amidst the profound stillness, the people were started by a wild outcry. A poor wretch was there who had the spirit of an unclean devil. With the pathos of intense fear he cried out, "Let us alone; what have we to do with Thee thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us?" All this might have resulted from the pungent nature of the teaching, but not the cry, "I know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God,"—this was something more than a random speech. We may imagine the shock which such a scene would produce in the midst of a sermon in one of our churches. Jesus, undisturbed and calm, enjoined silence, and with a word of command drove out the evil spirit. Then came the reaction; all men were filled with admiration and spread the news abroad. But Jesus, withdrawing from the tumult, secluded Himself during the heat of the day in Peter's house. There He found Peter's mother-in-law prostrated with a fever. At a touch of His hand she was healed, and resumed her household duties before them, as if she had not been sick. The whole city was alive with excitement.

"During the fiery noons of oriental cities men shut themselves up in their houses; but at evening they pour forth, and the gate of the city is the grand resort. Thither too, upon this same day, repaired Jesus, who was always drawn toward the multitudes. He was evidently expected and eagerly awaited. But now appeared a scene which only the imagination can depict. All the diseases which the violent heats in that climate breed upon the uncleanly habits and the squalid poverty of the masses were represented at the gate by appropriate subjects. Fevers, dropsies, paralyses, were there. The blind, the deaf, and—hovering on the edge afar-off—the lepers implored help. The lame came limping, and those too sick to help themselves were borne thither by friends, until the ample space was like a camp hospital—Jesus commenced among them His merciful work. It was a solemn and joyful scene. Human misery was exhibited here in many forms; but as, one by one, the touch or word of the Master healed it, came the rebound of exultation. Those who were coming, bearing the sick on couches, met returning happy groups of those who had been healed. Many tears of rejoicing fell, as children were given back to despairing mothers. Strange calmness in some natures, and wild exhilaration in others, attested the

rapture of deliverance from loathsome disease. Never, in all their memories had there been such an evening twilight of a Sabbath day." *

How these transactions contributed to the popularity of Jesus the Evangelist informs us. Jesus himself retires from the scene. In the morning He rose up a great while before it was day, went out, and departed into a solitary place. But the tumult of excitement had not subsided during the night, and at an early hour the people began to throng Peter's house to find Him again. Peter and his brother went forth to search for the wanderer. They found Him in his retirement. Simon salutes Him, saying, "All men seek for Thee;" and the people with him press around Jesus with affectionate violence, as if they would carry Him back to the city in their arms. They "came unto Him, and stayed Him, that He should not depart from them." But he replied to their importunity, "I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also."

The effects of Christ's teaching were heightened by the humanity, as well as power, of His miracles, and the tender sympathy which He manifested by them for the temporal comfort of men as well as for their spiritual well-being. For, again to quote from the charming pages of Mr. Beecher's Life of Jesus, His miracles were not mere explosions of power, designed to excite transcient wonder. They were instruments of kindness; they unsealed fountains of joy long closed; they tended to rectify the disorders which afflicted thousands of unhappy and neglected wretches; they gave emphasis to instruction; they ratified His exhortations; they gave solemnity to His simple methods. The miracles of Christ cannot be taken out of their life-connections and analyzed by themselves. They were to His teachings what gestures are to an orator, that go with his thoughts, and taken alone are of no value. They were the glowing expressions of sympathy. As in the moods of love, the eye, the lip, the face, have expressions that cannot be separated from the emotions which produce them, so was it with Christ's works of mercy. They were not pilosophical experiments upon nature, nor premeditated evidences of power. They were the the expressions of a tender sympathy with human suffering, the flashes of the light of love, the arms of God stretched forth for the rescue or consolation of the poor and needy.

We have traced the popularity of Jesus to its chief causes that we may have an intelligent conception of the fact, and

* Beecher's Life of Jesus, p. 284.

also to point out the lessons it teaches to the Christian ministry of the present day. As far as in them lies those who preach Christ's truth now should preach it as He did when on the earth. Rightly to fulfil their work the first requisite is that they be Christ-like. The mind that was in Him must also be in them. They must be fired with the same enthusiasm of humanity; moved with compassion on the multitudes who are scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd. In all things the disciple cannot be as his Lord, but in this the resemblance, or rather the identity, should be as complete as our nature is capable of. A true Christian ministry is the outcome of Christian goodness, and he who exercises it drinks of the cup that Christ drank of, and is baptized with the baptism that He was baptized with, so that like his Master he would give his life a ransom for many. It will be a ministry of beneficence as well as instruction, a ministry of the life as well as the lip. Christ's ministry teaches us that pulpit preaching is but a small part of Gospel preaching, and mere perfunctory preaching no Gospel preaching at all. Let ministers —let the church—awake to a conviction of this and act accordingly, then the Word of the Lord will soon have free course and be glorified by the common people hearing it gladly, because it is proclaimed to them with the demonstration of the Spirit and with power.

ART. I.—HYMNS, THEIR AUTHORSHIP AND HISTORY.

[*From the American* BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.]

CHRISTIAN Psalmody has a threefold history. There is the connected record of sacred song from the apostolic age to our own time; there is the personal history of authors, with the circumstances in the midst of which they composed; and there is also the history of particular hymns subsequently to their introduction by the Church into its public services, or by individual Christians into their private devotions.

A comprehensive history of hymns, according to our first distinction, would be a history of the Christian Church. The purity and fervour of the primitive faith; the persecutions of the early centuries; the outward prosperity which followed the baptism of Constantine; the profound stillness of the Middle Ages; the great awakenings in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the revivals of the eighteenth; and the missionary spirit of later times,—all, in turn, have moulded or modified the expressions with which men have sought to praise the Lord, and it would be difficult to divest these "hymns of the ages" of the social conditions and the experiences which gave rise to them. This is the scope of Mrs. Charles's interesting volume, "The Voice of Christian Life in Song," a work which, although less generally known than "The Chronicles of the Schönberg Cotta Family" and "The Diary of Kitty Trevelyan," by the same gifted author, is fully entitled to a place with them in the library of every Christian household. Mr. Christopher's recent publication is a gracefully written and familiar commentary upon hymn-writers and their hymns, containing, as the preface says, "chat about hymns, their birth and parentage, their circumstances, their character, and their influence." Our own purpose in the present article is similar to this; and while incidentally referring to history and to biography, we desire mainly to allude to the causes which produced and to the occasions which suggested a few of the hymns in use among us; also to notice the associations which in the lapse of time have accumulated about them and enriched them.

The authorship of many of our most familiar hymns is involved in uncertainty.

"Jerusalem, my happy home,"

which has been made the foundation of so many beautiful compositions, is one of these. The original itself is contained in a manuscript volume in the British Museum, the date of which is supposed to be about 1616, and is probably of Queen Elizabeth's time. It is there described as "a song by F. B. P., to the tune Diana." For two hundred years or more this sweet singer has rested in that happy harbour of the saints for which he so ardently longed; his sorrows have long since had an end, and with ineffable joy he has listened to the silver sound of the flood of life, as it flows "quite through the streets" of the heavenly Jerusalem. His aspiration, in the quaint language of the time, has, as we may believe, been abundantly fulfilled:

"Ah, my sweet home, Hierusalem,
Would God I were in thee;
Would God my woes were at an end,
Thy ioys that I might see!"

All this we have reason to believe; but who the man was whose initials we have before us, or what was his history, we shall never positively know, until we too shall have reached the beloved, the eternal city. Perhaps, as has been surmised, he was a prisoner in the Tower of London, for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. It is pleasant to conjecture concerning him; but this is all that is permitted to us. Such a hymn is like a portrait which has come down to us from the past, without any record of the original. Some of the finest heads painted by Titian, as Mrs. Jameson tells us, remain to this hour unknown; but a careful study of them may convey many vivid impressions respecting the persons they represent, what they were, and what they may have accomplished or suffered. So in an anonymous hymn the temperament or experience of the writer may be depicted so clearly that we shall seem to know all about him; we may trace in its lines the saintly virtues, the heroic conflicts, the exultant hopes, of him whose heart first felt and whose lips first uttered it, and we shall find ourselves drawn out towards him as to a brother. And yet it is true, as a rule, that our pleasure in a hymn is enhanced by our acquaintance with its origin and history; as, in a gallery, we delight most to behold the faces of those whose names and deeds are familiar to us.

A comparison of the life of an author with his hymns will throw a new light upon his character, while it will add to the interest of what he has written. Let us refer as an example to Isaac Watts. When we sing his plaintive and dirge-like psalm,

"Our God our help in ages past,"

or his tender, penitential, Christ-exalting hymn,

"When I survey the wondrous cross,"

it is pleasant to know something of the personal history of him who has struck the key-note for the worship of the sanctuary for all time. We like to think of the pious youth, quietly pursuing his studies in his father's house at Southampton, and composing each week a hymn to be sung on the succeeding Sabbath by the congregation with which he worshipped. His first hymn thus used,

"Behold the glories of the Lamb,"

still stands in his collection as the first hymn of the first book, and perhaps is hardly surpassed by any that follow it. Looking across to the Isle of Wight, he was led to meditate upon the "land of pure delight, where saints immortal reign." The river between was, to his poet's eye, the Jordan of death, but his cheerful faith was gladdened by the expanding view on the other side, and he wrote

"Sweet fields beyond the swelling flood
Stand dressed in living green."

We like to follow Watts to Stoke-Newington, where, in the midst of valuable public labours, he devoted himself to "the metrical imitation of David's Psalms into New Testament language," and to the composition of songs and catechisms for children; and we readily agree with what Dr. Johnson says in his life of this excellent man, "he never wrote but for a good purpose;" and again, every one acquainted with the common principles of human action will look with veneration on the writer who is at one time combating Locke, and at another making a catechism for children in their fourth year."

It is interesting also to read what is told us of the habit of Charles Wesley in the composition of his hymns: "He rode every day—clothed for winter, even in summer—a little horse gray with age. When he mounted, if a subject struck him, he proceeded to expand and put it in order. He would write a hymn thus given him on a card kept for the purpose, with his pencil in short-hand. Not unfrequently he has come to

the house in the City Road, and having left the pony in the garden, he would enter, crying out, 'Pen and ink! Pen and ink!' These being supplied, he wrote the hymn he had been composing. When this was done, he would look round on those present, and salute them with much kindness."

The more we examine the structure and significance of hymns, the more we shall be impressed with the deep personality of a very great number of them; and we shall find also that those have taken the strongest hold upon the heart of the church which are the most decidedly personal, subjective, and experimental. Nor does an interest of this kind attach only to sacred poetry. It has been said of Bryon, that he was "himself the beginning, the middle, and the end of all his poetry, the hero of every tale, the chief object in every landscape." And Southey remarks in his life of Cowper: "There are no passages in a poet's works which are more carped at while he lives, than those wherein he speaks of himself; and if he has any readers after his death, there are none then which are perused with greater interest." In hymns this reference to one's own conditions and feelings may be less obvious to the casual observer than in other poetry, but it will not be the less likely to manifest itself to those whose experiences or sympathies enable them to apprehend it.

Charles Wesley, we are told never allowed a birthday to pass, without writing a cheerful hymn. His verses beginning,

"O for a thousand tongues to sing,"

were written on the anniversary of his conversion, his spiritual birthday. In his journal Wesley records the labours of a Sunday at Gwennap, in Cornwall, when, as he says, "nine or ten thousand by computation listened with all eagerness while I commended them to God and to the word of his grace. For near two hours I was enabled to preach repentance towards God, and faith in Jesus Christ. I broke out again and again in prayer and exhortation. I believed not one word would return empty. Seventy years' sufferings were overpaid by one such opportunity." After this memorable occasion this faithful servant of the Lord poured out the thanksgiving of his heart in jubilant hymn:

"All thanks be to God,
Who scatters abroad
Throughout every place,
By the least of his servants, his savour of grace;
Who the victory gave,
The praise let him have,

For the work he hath done;
All honour and glory to Jesus alone!"

Another favourite writer of hymns for the people, Joseph Hart, the author of

"Come, ye sinners, poor and wretched,
Weak and wounded, sick and sore,

gives us a view of some of the inner experiences which lead to the composition of devotional and penetential hymns. "The week before Easter, 1757, I had such an amazing view of the agony of Christ in the garden as I know not how well to describe. I was lost in wonder and adoration, and the impression was too deep, I believe, ever to be obliterated. I shall say no more of this, but only remark that, notwithstanding all that is talked about the sufferings of Jesus, none can know anything of them but by the Holy Ghost; and I believe that he that knows most knows but very little. It was then I made the first part of my hymn on the Passion:

Come all ye chosen saints of God,
That long to feel the cleansing blood,
In pensive pleasures join with me,
To sing of sad Gethsemane."

In such instances as these we see that certain circumstances in the history of the author were indispensable to the production of the songs which he uttered. An outburst of joy, a wail of anguish, an offering of thanksgiving, a tribute of worship,—whatever the nature of the hymn, it had its origin in some profound feeling of the soul which could not be repressed. "I believed, therefore have I spoken." It might be added, "I worshipped, therefore have I sung." Some Christians have composed but a single hymn, their hearts, like a rare flower, blossoming but once upon the earth; others have left their songs, like scattered fragrance, all along the path of their pilgrimage.

This leads us to notice also that our most useful and precious hymns have generally been produced in the midst of trials and difficulties. We should have anticipated, perhaps, that the cloisters of the Middle Ages, and other quiet retreats of pious souls, and the peaceful flow of a calm Christian experience, would yield the richest utterances in holy song; but it is not so. "The battle songs of the Church," says Mrs. Charles, "are written on the battle-field." For we must not forget that the healthy condition of the Church on earth is not one of rest. The eternal Sabbath-keeping is yet before us in the future. Under the present dispensation the Church

truly lives and is in health only as it is engaged in conflict with the various forms of evil by which it is surrounded, and the heart of the believer is never so attuned to sweetest harmony as when deeply in earnest in its struggles with indwelling sin or outward corruptions, or as when weighed down under the mysterious and afflictive allotments of divine Providence. Shelley says in one of his best lines:

"They learn by suffering what they teach in song."

"The dear cross hath pressed many songs out of me," said Rist. Of Paul Gerhardt it is remarked, "one of his most beautiful hymns,

"Wake up my heart and sing,"

was composed on the steps of the altar at Lübben, after a night of anguish. Every line of it breathes the deepest trust and peace."

So deeply experimental has that affecting hymn,

"Jesus, I my cross have taken,"

been seen to be, that in the uncertainty which for some time existed in reference to its authorship, it was quite generally supposed to have been composed for the use and support of the devoted missionary, Henry Martyn, and was attributed to Miss Grenfell, the lady to whom he was engaged to be married. It is now known to have been written by the Rev. Henry Francis Lyte, vicar of Brixham, in South Devon, the author of two delightful volumes, "Tales in Verse," and "Poems, chiefly religious." We should be quite sure beforehand that he who could write the hymn of self-renunciation and of consecration to the Saviour just referred to, must have been called to many and bitter trials and disappointments; and on referring to the memoirs of Mr. Lyte we find that he was, although of good family, somewhat straitened in his circumstances in early life, that he had to struggle hard to obtain a liberal education, that to use his own language, he was jostled from one curacy to another, and that when at length he was settled in the parish of Brixham, where indeed he was much beloved, he had a great deal to try him in his pastorate, and much to contend with in his own feeble and gradually failing health. Such poems as that now before us, and another, kindred to it, entitled "Submission," beginning:

"Yet think not, O my soul, to keep
Thy progress on to God,
By any road less rough and steep
Than that thy fathers trod,"

were not composed merely for the pleasure of composition, but they were the breathings of a spirit that must have utterance; the songs of such devoted saints of God are as natural and as necessary as their prayers upon their knees. Under such pressure the psalmist wrote, when he said: "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God, for I shall yet praise Him who is the health of my countenance and my God!" Or when he said: "Surely I have behaved and quieted myself as a child that is weaned of his mother; my soul is even as a weaned child. Let Israel hope in the Lord henceforth and for ever."

Times of public calamity also suggest the strains with which holy men seek to guide the metrical prayers and praises of the Christian Church. Luther's first hymn is said to have been called forth by the death of two martyrs of Christ, Augustine monks, burnt at Brussels, the earliest victims in the Flemish provinces for the reformed faith. The period of the thirty years' war greatly enriched German hymnology. Several of Charles Wesley's judgment hymns were written at the close of the year 1755, just when the public mind in England was agitated by the news of the Lisbon earthquake. In this earthquake, and in the fire which swept the city directly afterwards, between thirty and forty thousand persons were supposed to have perished. It would be interesting to quote the details of that awful event, keeping in mind the suddenness of the shock, and the brevity of its duration,—only two or three minutes,—and then to turn to some of the startling verses in which the poet describes the final catastrophe, as, for example:

"Every island, sea, and mountain,
Heaven and earth shall flee away;
All who hate Him, must, confounded,
Hear the trump proclaim the day:
Come to judgment,
Come to judgment, come away!"

or again,

"Stand th' omnipotent decree;
Jehovah's will be done!
Nature's end we wait to see,
And hear her final groan;
Let this earth dissolve and blend
In death the wicked and the just;
Let those pond'rous orbs descend,
And grind us into dust."

Bernard and Tersteegen may perhaps be mentioned as exceptions to the rule which we have sought to illustrate, that a life of conflict and strife is the most favourable for the production of hymns which the Church will delight to remember and to use; but we think on the contrary the history of their lives most pointedly confirms it. The former was indeed a monk, but his was no inactive career. He founded, and for nearly forty years, presided over, the Abbey at Clairvaux; he was occupied with many labours, both civil and ecclesiastical; and more than all, by the preaching of the second crusade, he aroused Europe from its lethargy,—intellectual, social, spiritual. He was the great reformer, we had almost said the revivalist, of the twelfth century. And Tersteegen, although he partly preferred retirement, and adopted the quiet employment of a ribbon-maker, in order that he might pass his time in uninterrupted meditation, was not permitted to indulge himself in this respect. Two quotations will indicate the manner of life of him who wrote the favourite verses, beginning:

> "Thou hidden love of God, whose height,
> Whose depth unfathomed, no man knows."

He writes at one time: "There is still, God be thanked, a great awakening and stir among the people here; for some weeks together, from morning to night, they were compelled to wait one for another, to have an opportunity of speaking with me. Many were obliged to return five or six times before a quarter of an hour could be found to converse with me alone; and I have occasionally had ten, twenty, and even thirty, anxious souls with me at the same time." And again, several years later: "Last Sunday I had scarcely risen from my bed, when I was obliged to address more than sixty persons who had thronged into the house. After I had done speaking I had to converse with various individuals until evening. And yesterday morning, after I had passed the whole night in a fever, at least two hundred and fifty people assembled in the corn-loft and in the room adjoining, to whom I spoke, with the Lord's gracious assistance. I spoke to-day on the last words of the Lord Jesus, 'It is finished,' and comforted myself with the hope that my toils and troubles would also soon be finished."

Well did Adam of St. Victor sing in his hymn on the martyrdom of St. Lawrence:

"As the harp-strings only render
All their treasures of sweet sound,
All their music, glad or tender,
Firmly struck and tightly bound;

So the hearts of Christians owe
Each its deepest, sweetest strain,
To the pressure firm of woe,
And the tension tight of pain.

Spices crushed their pungence yield,
Trodden scents their sweets respire;
Would you have its strength revealed,
Cast the incense in the fire.

Thus the crushed and broken frame
Oft doth sweetest graces yield;
And through suffering, toil and shame,
From the martyr's keenest flame,
Heavenly incense is distilled."

A more particular reference to some hymns, interesting from their antiquity, their history, or their authorship, will serve further to illustrate what has already been said. Although not invariably following the order of time, it will be natural to speak first of the oldest hymn in our collections:

"Shepherd of tender youth,
Guiding in love and truth
Through devious ways,—
Christ our triumphant King,
We come Thy name to sing,
And here our children bring
To shout Thy praise."

It is found in Greek in the words of Clement of Alexandria, who flourished at the close of the second century. We find it difficult to realize the age of this ancient hymn. It dates from a period long before the unknown author sang his song of Jerusalem; long before the Dies Irae was composed; long before the Te Deum became a part of the service of the Church. It takes us back to primitive days, and almost to the immediate successors of the Apostles. The following verse, a literal translation, from the "Voice of Christian Life in Song," will convey an idea of its peculiar style and structure:

These babes
With tender lips
Nourished;
By the dew of the Spirit

Replenished;
Their artless praises,
Their true hymns,
O Christ, our King,—
Sacred rewards
Of the doctrine of life,—
We hymn together;
We hymn in simplicity,
The mighty child.
The chorus of peace,
The kindred of Christ,
The race of the temperate,
We will praise together the God of peace."

It is interesting to notice that the first outpouring of Christian souls in sacred song was in language which children may use in their worship of the Saviour. The Alexandrian Clement wrote with a heart full of sympathy for the lambs of the flock. Ephraim the Syrian, the next hymn-writer of whom we know, and who lived a century later, manifested the same interest in the young. And in this nineteenth century, the last hymn written by the sainted Montgomery before his promotion to the heavenly choirs, was for a Sunday-school celebration. Thus we see that although Sunday schools, as they now exist, are a modern agency in the church, the spirit which devised them and which sustains them is the same as that of the earliest days; then, as now, Christians manifested their attachment to the Redeemer by their care for those whom, when upon the earth, he ever regarded with most tender love.

Another ancient hymn deserving our notice, is:

"The pangs of death are near,
Amid the joys of life;
And when in guilty fear
We end our dying strife,
To whom, most holy Lord,
Shall we for succour flee?
O Thou most mighty God,
Our help is laid on Thee!
Lord Jesus, by Thy bloody stains,
Save, save us from hell's bitter pains."

Seven hundred years after the death of Clement, Notker, a Benedictine monk of St. Gall, saw some workmen engaged in building the bridge of Martinsbruck at the peril of their lives. The terrors of the spot and the exposure of the men suggested to the beholder, who is said to have lisped in his speech, but who certainly did not falter in his verses, this hymn, which is

called "Media in vita." It was soon set to music, and was universally adopted, first as a battle song, and subsequently as a dirge. Luther's version is spirited and evangelical; in reading it as translated by Miss Winkworth, in the Lyra Germanica, we can almost see the fearful Alpine gorge, the frail overhanging scaffold, and the men with only a rope and a plank between them and eternity; and we experience a like shudder to that which came over the holy man more than nine hundred years ago:

"In the midst of life, behold
Death has girt us round:
Whom for help then shall we pray,
Where shall grace be found?

. . . . . .

"In the midst of death, the jaws
Of hell against us gape:
Who from peril dire as this
Openeth us escape?"

His hymn, not in metrical form, is read in the burial-service of the Episcopal Church, and will doubtless thus continue in use until the second coming of our Lord to fulfil the promise given ages ago: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." The celebrated Robert Hall once looked in the Bible to find the familiar words "In the midst of life we are in death," as the text for a sermon. "So venerable," remarks an eminent scholar, "does a Christian hymn become which has lived a thousand years."

In this connection it will be appropriate to refer to Charles Wesley's sublime hymn,

"Thou God of glorious majesty,
To Thee, against myself, to Thee,
A worm of earth I cry;
An half-awakened child of man,
An heir of endless bliss or pain,
A sinner born to die."

In most of our books this first verse is omitted, and the hymn commences: "Lo, on a narrow neck of land." It was written on the Land's end in Cornwall, which is literally a "narrow neck," stretching out into the Atlantic. Dr. Adam Clarke describes the locality in a letter written Oct. 11, 1819: "I write this on the last projecting point of rock of the Land's End, upwards of two hundred feet perpendicular above the sea, which is raging and roaring tremendously, threatening

destruction to myself and the narrow point of rock on which I am sitting. On my right hand is the Bristol Channel, and before me the vast Atlantic Ocean. This is the place where Charles Wesley composed those fine lines,

> 'Lo, on a narrow neck of land
> 'Twixt two unbounded seas I stand,
> Secure, insensible!
> A point of time, a moment's space,
> Removes me to that heavenly place,—
> Or shuts me up in hell.'"

With the danger of our situation thus striking and solemnly set forth, who of us can hesitate to join fervently in the prayer,

> "O God, mine inmost soul convert,
> And deeply on my thoughtful heart
> Eternal things impress;
> Give me to feel their solemn weight
> And tremble on the brink of fate,
> And wake to righteousness."

The psalmist very probably had some such dangerous steep in mind when he wrote: "Surely thou didst set them in slippery places; thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation as in a moment! They are utterly consumed with terrors."

We cannot pass unmentioned the "Dies Irae," the great mediæval hymn, which has descended to us enriched with the associations of six centuries. Its reputed author is Thomas von Celano, a Franciscan monk. The first line, so startling and solemn, was suggested by the words of the prophet Zephaniah:* "That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness."

It is justly observed by Dr. Coles, that "of the Latin hymns this is the best known, and the acknowledged masterpiece. There are others which possess much sweetness and beauty, but this stands unrivalled. It has superior beauties with none of their defects. For the most part they are more or less Romish; but this is Catholic, and not Romish at all. It is universal as humanity. It is the cry of the human soul. It bears indubitable marks of being a personal experience."

The translations of this hymn into German and English are almost numberless. It has also been translated into other languages, and recently into modern Greek, by an English

* Zeph. i. 15, which in the Vulgate reads, "Dies irae, dies illa, dies tribulationis et angustiae," etc.

missionary in the East. Excellent however as many of these translations are, it is declared by those capable of judging, that not one of them does justice to the original. In the Latin the rhyme is double, and the cadence particularly solemn and affecting. Boswell tells us that Dr. Johnson, who was fond of repeating this hymn, frequently burst into tears when he came to the following stanza:

"Quaerens me sedisti lassus,
Redemisti crucem passus,
Tantus labor non sit cassus!

Archbishop Trench, who has given us the closest of the English versions, translates these lines thus:

"Tired Thou satest, seeking me,
Crucified to set me free;
Let such pain not fruitless be?"

Sir Walter Scott has given us a paraphrase of the opening verse, in some lines of great power and solemnity, in the Lay of the Last Minstrel, which are frequently used in our churches. They are introduced thus:

"The mass was sung and prayers were said,
And solemn requiem for the dead;
And bells tolled out their mighty peal,
For the departed spirit's weal;
And ever in the office close
The hymn of intercession rose;
And far the echoing aisles prolong
The awful burden of the song.
Dies irae, Dies illa!
Solvet soeclum in favilla.

"While the pealing organ rung,—
Were it meet with sacred strain
To close my lay so light and vain,—
Thus the holy fathers sung:

"That day of wrath! that dreadful day
When heaven and earth shall pass away!
What power shall be the sinner's stay?
How shall he meet that dreadful day?

"When shrivelling like a parched scroll,
The flaming heavens together roll;
And louder yet, and still more dread,
Swells the high trump that wakes the dead!

"Oh, on that day, that wrathful day,
When man to judgment wakes from clay,
Be thou the trembling sinners stay,
When heaven and earth shall pass away!

Sir Walter, in his last days of life and reason, was frequently overheard quoting this hymn, with portions of the old Scotch Psalms and of the Scriptures. An earlier poet, the Earl of Roscommon, a serious-minded and accomplished man, uttered in the moment he expired (1684) with great energy, two lines of his own translation of the "Dies Irae," excelling all others, it has been said, in the fervour of its devotion, to be found in some of our books,

"My God, my Father, and my Friend,
Do not forsake me in the end!"

Upon this impressive hymn, Mozart founded his celebrated Requiem, the last he ever composed.

Among the many noble hymns, for which we are indebted to the great Protestant Reformation on the continent of Europe, that known as the battle-song of Gustavus Adolphus, has perhaps the most interesting history:

"Fear not, O little flock, the foe
Who madly seeks your overthrow;
Dread not his rage and power:
What though your courage sometimes faints,
This seeming triumph o'er God's saints
Lasts but a little hour."

In the Lyra Germanica this is attributed to Altenberg, but its authorship is by some ascribed to the great Gustavus himself, who is said to have given it in substance to his chaplain, by whom it was moulded into verse. Every line is characteristic of the great warrior, whose piety was almost as remarkable as his military prowess. The grandson of Gustavus Vasa—the first Protestant prince who had worn the regal diadem,—he devoted himself, from the day he ascended the throne, to the cause of civil and religious liberty. Not only as a soldier and a statesman, but as a Christian, his ideas were far in advance of the age in which he lived; for in 1627 he proposed opening trade with the West Indies, partly for purposes of commercial enterprise, and partly for spreading the sacred truths of the gospel over those then uncultivated and unenlightened regions.

When meditating the invasion of the empire, he said: "If it is the will of the Supreme Being that Gustavus must die in the defence of his country, he pays the tribute with thankful acquiescence; it is a king's duty and religion to obey the great

sovereign of kings without a murmur." This spirit of submission to and reliance upon the Most High he manifested throughout those memorable campaigns. His first thought upon landing in Germany, was to commit himself and his army in prayer to God. At Leipsic he gave the battle-cry "God with us"; the noblest ever adopted by a Christian here. This hymn, now before us, was his favourite battle-song; and the account which the historian gives of the last occasion upon which he used it belongs to the annals of sacred song.

On the morning of his last battle, November 6th, 1632, when the armies of Gustavus and Wallenstein were drawn up, waiting until the morning mist dispersed, to commence the attack, the king commanded Luther's grand psalm, "God is a stronghold firm and sure," to be sung, and then, "Fear not, O little flock, the foe," accompanied by the drums and trumpets of the whole army. Immediately afterwards the mist broke, and the sunshine burst on the two armies. For a moment Gustavus Adolphus knelt beside his horse in face of his soldiers, and repeated his usual battle-prayer, "O Lord Jesus Christ, bless our arms and this day's battle, for the glory of Thy holy name." Then passing along the lines, with a few brief words of encouragement, he gave the cry, "God with us;" the same with which he had conquered on the field of Leipsic. Thus began the day which laid him low amidst the thickest of the fight. After being wounded by the imperial cuirassiers, they asked him who he was; he replied boldly, "I am the king of Sweden, and seal with my blood the Protestant religion, and the liberties of Germany;" adding, likewise, "alas my poor queen!" His last words were, "My God, my God!" His body bore the marks of eight wounds, three received previously, the rest upon this fatal day.

This song, thus baptized in blood on the plains of Lutzen, has imparted strength to many a soldier of the cross during the two centuries that have succeeded. In our own land, within the last few years, its words have been altogether appropriate for the inspiration of our armies, and for the consolation of our citizens. We remember that on the evening of the Monday, in the Summer of 1861, upon which the intelligence of the first battle of Bull Run was received, we were with friends in the country, where the latest news from town could not be obtained, and all were much depressed by the greatly exaggerated accounts of that reverse which at first prevailed. It was then that this old battle-song was referred to, and if it had been written expressly for the emergency, its recital could not have proved more appropriate or consolatory. It was like a voice from heaven:

"This seeming triumph o'er God's saints,
Lasts but a little hour."

At the opening of the eighteenth century Joseph Addison, then a young man, left his native land to enrich his mind by foreign travel. This journey gave rise to a composition sometimes published as an imitation of a part of the one hundred and seventh psalm:

"How are Thy servants blest, O Lord,
How sure is there defence!"

His biographer informs us that in the month of December 1700, he embarked at Marseilles, Even at that season, the coast along which he sailed was rich with verdure, but he soon encountered one of the sudden and severe storms so common on the Mediterranean Sea. The captain gave up all for lost, and confessed himself to a monk who happened to be on board. Addison spent the solemn moments more profitably. The storm abated, and he reached Genoa in safety; but the impression made upon his mind by this peril, and by his providential deliverence was abiding, and is believed to have suggested some of the stanzas of the hymn referred to:

"When by the dreadful tempest borne,
High on the broken wave,
They know Thou art not slow to hear,
Nor impotent to save.

The storm is laid, the winds retire,
Obedient to Thy will;
The sea that roars at Thy command,
At Thy command is still."

Passing through the Papal States, Addison went to Naples, and after a time came back to Rome, and there spent the hot and sickly months of August and September, when for the inhabitants even, much more for strangers, it is extremely hazardous to remain. His gratitude for his safety under this exposure is recorded in the verse:

"In foreign realms and lands remote,
Supported by Thy care,
Through burning climes they pass unhurt,
And breathe in tainted air."

Montgomery calls this "the traveller's hymn." Dr. Kirk has told us that when travelling in Syria in 1857, in the sickly season, he and his companion frequently sang this beautiful psalm of confidence and praise; and many another traveller

by land and by sea has found in these pious verses a condensed and appropriate expression of his own feelings, not to be surpassed by anything he could himself have framed.

Addison's sacred poems which appeared in the Saturday numbers of the Spectator with his religious meditations, are well known to us all, and several of them have a permanent place in our collections of hymns. Montgomery says of them: "It is only to be regretted that they are not more in number, and that the God of grace as well as the God of Providence is not more distinctly recognized in them."

Macaulay has beautifully epitomized the life of this pure-minded man and elegant scholar, in the language of some of his own hymns; and as an illustration of what has already been said upon the individuality of hymns, we cannot forbear to quote the passage: "The piety of Addison was, in truth, of a singularly cheerful character. The feeling which predominates in all his devotional writings is gratitude God was to him the all-wise and all powerful friend, who had watched over his cradle with more than maternal tenderness; who had listened to his cries before they could form themselves in prayer; who had preserved his youth from the snares of vice; who had made his cup run over with worldly blessings; who had doubled the value of those blessings by bestowing a thankful heart to enjoy them, and dear friends to partake them; who had rebuked the waves of the Ligurian Gulf, had purified the autumnal air of the Campagna, and had restrained the avalanches of Mount Cenis. Of the Psalms, his favourite was that which represents the ruler of all things under the endearing image of a shepherd, whose crook guides the flock safe through gloomy and desolate glens to meadows well watered and rich with herbage. On that goodness to which he ascribed all the happiness of his life, he relied in the hour of death with the love which casteth out fear. He died on the 17th of June, 1719, having just entered on his forty-eighth year."

His message to his step-son, the gay young Earl of Warwick, is well known. "Come," said he, "and see how a Christian can die." It suggested the lines in the touching eulogy of Tickell:

> "He taught us how to live, and, oh, too high
> The price of knowledge, taught us how to die."

There are hymns which, in consequence of the benefits conferred by them upon some servant of the Lord whose name and experience are precious to the Church, have in a sense become hallowed, like sanctuaries in which souls have been

born again and fitted for the skies; Christian tears have watered them; Christian faith has triumphed in them; by their means lowly and contrite spirits have been raised to communion with their God. Superadded to the interest of their authorship and to their intrinsic value is this almost heavenly radiance with which religious biography has invested them. Every reader will recall some such. As an example we may mention,

"The God of Abrah'm praise,"

written by Thomas Olivers, one of Wesley's co-labourers, a singularly gifted, although not an educated man. Montgomery says of it: "This noble ode, though the essay of an unlettered man, claims special honour. There is not in our language a lyric of more majestic style, more elevated thought, or more glorious imagery.

Mr. Christophers draws an interesting comparison between Byron's plaintive and melodious imitation of the one hundred and thirty-seventh psalm,

"We sat down and wept by the waters
Of Babel, and thought of the day,"

with the magnificent verses which Scott has put on the lips of his heroine Rebecca,

"When Israel of the Lord beloved,
Out from the land of bondage came."

and with the hymn by Olivers now before us, and he says: "The hymns of this remarkable trio are like a 'psalm of degrees.' They move in an upward gradation, raising the swell of Christian song until it rivals the music of Hebrew fathers. Under Byron's hand the distinctive form of beauty begins to breathe and unfold its tender charms. At Scott's touch it expands into more majestic proportions, and puts forth more of its inner life. But at Olivers's command it manifests its maturity of soul, and gives full and harmonious expression to all its heavenliness of thought and affection. In the course of conversation a few years ago, the son of an old minister said: 'I remember my father telling me that he was once standing in the aisle of City Road Chapel, during a Conference in Wesley's time, and Thomas Olivers, one of the preachers, came down to me, and said, Look at this; I have rendered it from the Hebrew, giving it as far as I could a Christian character, and I have called on Leoni the Jew, who has given me a synagogue melody to suit it; here is the tune, and it is to be called Leoni.'"

But we refer to this hymn particularly in this connection,

because of its association with the cherished name of Henry Martyn. While that devoted follower of the Saviour was at Falmouth, awaiting the final departure of the fleet with which he was to leave England for ever, he wrote in his journal, under date of July 29, 1805, as follows: "I was much engaged at intervals in learning the hymn,

'The God of Abrah'm praise;'

As often as I could use the language of it with any truth, my heart was a little at ease.

'The God of Abrah'm praise,
At whose supreme command,
From earth I rise, and seek the joys
At His right hand.
I all on earth forsake,—
Its wisdom, fame, and power,—
And Him my only portion make,
My shield and tower.'

"There was something peculiarly solemn and affecting to me in this hymn, and particularly at this time. The truth of the sentiments I knew well enough. But alas, I felt that the state of mind expressed in it was above mine at the time; and I felt loth to forsake all on earth."

We think we may safely affirm that these admirable lines were never more appropriately adopted than by this holy man. Martyn was forsaking all on earth, brilliant academic fame and position, usefulness and eminence in the English Church, a cultivated home in the land to which his ardent soul so tenaciously clung, tender and appreciative friends, and one dearer than all besides. It was no ordinary sacrifice to which he was called. To any man it would have been most severe; to him it was crushing.

It is profitable for us, who think we sometimes deny ourselves and take up the cross, although as compared with the experience of Martyn, such self-denial is hardly worthy of the name, to recall a hymn whose pious sentiments and exalted strain imparted to him under such circumstances peace and consolation. "Solemn and affecting" to us is this hymn, because he thus made it his own.

Doubtless it was much in his mind during the voyage; for in his journal under date of September 28th, off Maderia, he writes: "O for the steady abiding under the shadow of the Almighty; and as the days pass on and bring me nearer to the end of the things which are seen, so let me be more and more quickened, to be ready for the unseen world.

'By faith I see the land
With peace and plenty blest,—
Land of sacred liberty,
And endless rest.'"

We do not remember any other allusion to this hymn in his writings; but we doubt not that in far-off India and in Persia he repeated it with refreshment to his spirit; and it may be that when, in the solitudes of Asiatic Turkey, among strangers, and almost equally removed from beloved ones east and west, he felt the approach of death, he quoted with triumphant confidence:

"He by Himself hath sworn;
I on His oath depend:
I shall, on eagle's wings upborne,
To heaven ascend.
I shall behold His face;
I shall His power adore;
And sing the wonders of His grace
For evermore."

The illustration of our subject would not be complete without a special reference to Cowper—to the circumstances of his life, and to some of the hymns which in the Providence of God these produced. Cowper at the age of thirty-two was overtaken by a morbid melancholy, which soon assumed the most alarming form, and at length developed into insanity. Although he had been correct in his outward life, and blameless in his intercourse with his fellow-men, he had not then experienced the renewing power of the Spirit of God; and his insanity, under the influence of strong religious convictions, took the form of blank and utter despair about the salvation of his soul. Having made repeated attempts at self-destruction, he was removed to St. Albans, to the house of Dr. Cotton, a pious and skilful physician. Five months he passed in continual expectation that the Divine vengeance would instantly plunge him into the bottomless pit. But such horrors in madness are like those in dreams; the maniac and the dreamer seem to undergo what could not possibly be undergone by one awake or in his senses; and indeed he says that after five months of this expectation he became so familiar with despair as to entertain a sort of hardiness and indifference as to the event." Some lines written just before his removal to Dr. Cotton's asylum, give us an insight into his state of mind at that period:

"Hatred and vengeance, my eternal portion,
Scarce can endure delay of execution,—
Wait with impatient readiness to sieze my
Soul in a moment.

Damned below Judas; more abhorred than he was,
Who for a few pence sold his Holy Master;
Twice-betrayed Jesus, me the last delinquent,
Deems the profanest.

Man disavows, and Deity disowns me,
Hell might afford my miseries a shelter;
Therefore hell keeps her ever hungry mouths all
Bolted against me!"

Is it possible to conceive the condition of a man who firmly believed the awful truth thus depicted with such nervous and desperate power? But now mark the change. After an interval his mental symptoms improved; a visit from his brother, who was a fellow of one of the colleges at Cambridge, and in whose conversion on his death-bed the poet was afterwards made instrumental, served to put to flight as he says a thousand deliriums and delusions which he still laboured under. At about the same time he found, during one of his walks in the garden, a Bible which had been purposely placed in his way. "The Lord was pleased to reveal himself in his word, and to draw the poor, desponding soul to his own bosom of infinite love." Let us quote from Cowper's own account of these memorable experiences: "Immediately I received strength to believe, and the full beams of the Sun of Righteousness shone upon me. I saw the sufficiency of the atonement Christ had made, my pardon sealed in His blood, and all the fulness and completeness of His justification. Unless the Almighty arm had been under me I think I should have died with gratitude and joy. My eyes filled with tears, and my voice choked with transport; I could only look up to heaven with silent fear, overwhelmed with love and wonder. I lost no opportunity of repairing to a throne of grace, but flew to it with an earnestness irresistable and never to be satisfied. Could I help it? Could I do otherwise than love and rejoice in my reconciled Father in Christ Jesus? The Lord had enlarged my heart, and I ran in the way of His commandments. For many succeeding weeks tears were ready to flow if I did but speak of the Gospel, or mention the name of Jesus. To rejoice day and night was all my employment. Too happy to sleep much, I thought it was lost time that was spent in slumber. My physician, ever watchful and apprehensive for my welfare, was now alarmed, lest the sudden transition from

despair to joy should terminate in a fatal frenzy. But the Lord was my strength and song, and was become my salvation. I said, 'I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord. He hath chastened me sore, but hath not given me over unto death. O give thanks unto the Lord, for His mercy endureth for ever.' In a short time Dr. Cotton became satisfied, and acquiesced in the soundness of my cure; and much sweet communion I had with him concerning the things of our salvation." In Cowper's poem on Hope, the well-known passage commencing,

"So when a felon whom his country's laws,"

beautifully portrays this precious and marvellous transformation. While still continuing at St. Albans, he wrote a hymn entitled "The happy change," and took for his text a sentence from the Book of Revelation, "Behold, I make all things new." As Southey says: "The contrast is indeed striking between what he calls this specimen of his first Christian thoughts, and that song of despair which cannot be perused without shuddering:"

"How blest thy creature is, O God,
When, with a single eye,
He views the lustre of Thy word,
The day-spring from on high.

Through all the storms that veil the skies
And frown on earthly things,
The Sun of Righteousness he eyes,
With healing on his wings.

Struck by that light, the human heart—
A barren soil no more—
Sends the sweet smell of grace abroad,
Where serpents lurked before.

The soul, a dreary province once
Of Satan's dark domain,
Feels a new empire formed within,
And owns a heavenly reign.

The glorious orb whose golden beams
The fruitful year control,
Since first obedient to Thy word,
He started from the goal,

Has cheered the nations with the joys
His orient rays impart;
But Jesus, 't is thy light alone
Can shine upon the heart."

Having resolved not to return to London, with its busy and exciting scenes, his friends arranged for him to reside quietly at Huntingdon; and it was in view of his withdrawal from society and from his profession that he composed the sweet hymn worthy, as has been said, of comparison with the best productions of Collins and Gray:

"Far from the world, O Lord, I flee,
From strife and tumult far;
From scenes where Satan wages still
His most successful war."

When with a remembrance of all the unspeakable agony through which Cowper passed during those dreadful months, and of that season of heavenly peace which ensued, we read his hymn, "There is a fountain filled with blood," it is apparent that every line and sentence were called forth by his own experience. He had said, "I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord;" and in these verses most sweetly has he done so. Not now with Judas Iscariot, but with the penitent thief, does he compare himself:

"The dying thief rejoiced to see
That fountain in his day;
And there have I, as vile as he,
Washed all my sins away."

In calm, heaven-given confidence thus he sang. Some compilers of hymns must have felt that either they or the people for whom they prepared their books, could not thus positively declare what the Lord had done for their souls; and they have therefore extracted all the assurance from this beautiful stanza, and have made it read,

"And there may I, though vile as he,
Wash all my sins away."

These counterfeit lines do not represent Cowper's feeling when he composed this hymn; he honoured his Redeemer with an unqualified trust: in his own words, "he saw the sufficiency of the atonement Christ had made, his pardon sealed in his blood, and all the fulness and completeness of his justification." Perhaps it was necessary for the Christian poet to have drunk to the dregs the bitter cup of despair, in order that he might the more understandingly and triumphantly sing of salvation by grace. Certainly there is no other hymn of the same kind, which has obtained such a hold upon the warmest affection of the Church; and without question, it will continue to be used in the service of the sanctuary, at the domestic altar, and in the closet,

"Till all the ransomed church of God
Be saved, to sin no more."

From Huntingdon, Cowper removed to Olney, where he lived upon the most intimate and confidential terms with the excellent John Newton. Here, that collection of hymns was projected, which has been and is so greatly esteemed by Christians of every name, and which, as Mr. Newton suggests in the preface, "stands as a monument to perpetuate the remembrance of an intimate and endeared friendship." But Cowper had not proceeded far in this work when his distressing malady came back upon him. "The clouds returned after the rain." His sun was clouded at noon, and although afterwards there were some gleams of light upon his horizon, the sky was never clear to him again; the gloom settled more and more densely around him, and he walked in darkness profound and awful, "darkness which might be felt," until the blessed morning of his final deliverance, when, as we believe, he was admitted to that city which "the glory of God doth lighten, and the Lamb is the light thereof." We think the progress of his disorder may be traced in several of the Olney hymns; his last contribution to the collection, composed when despair was already seizing upon him, was that noble hymn which so wonderfully vindicates the ways of God to men:

"God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform."

The precious consolations of this hymn were ineffectual to heal the stricken heart of the singer, or perhaps it were more correct to say, they failed to withstand the approach of the mental disease with which he was afflicted; but oh, how many sinking souls have been buoyed up by these verses, when all the waves and the billows of the Almighty were surging around them.

"The nightingale sings best
When her soft and downy breast
Is bleeding with the thorn." *

*Cowper, in a hymn already alluded to, compares his soul in its devotional retirement to this timid recluse, of whom Milton sings in Il Penseroso:

"Sweet bird, that shun'st the voice of folly,
Most musical, most melancholy."

He bore no resemblance to Wordsworth's "ethereal minstrel, pilgrim of the sky," the lark, to whom the poet says—

"Leave to the nightingale her shady wood,
A privacy of glorious light is thine."

His own beautiful verse is—

"There, like a nightingale, she pours,
Her solitary lays;
Nor asks a witness of her song,
Nor thirsts for human praise."

Thus was it with Cowper in the composition of this admirable hymn; and having uttered it, the Lord seems to have put His servant on trial, so that its testimony might be signally confirmed in the experience of its author.

During these tedious and mournful years, Cowper's soul waited for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning. At one time he writes, "the dealings of God with me are to myself utterly unintelligible. I have never met, either in books or conversation, with an experience at all similar to mine. More than a twelvemonth has passed since I began to hope that having walked the whole breadth of the bottom of the Red Sea, I was beginning to climb the opposite shore, and I proposed to sing the song of Moses. But I have been disappointed." Yet, disappointed and disheartened though he was, not one word of murmuring or complaint is to be found in his letters; never did he question the wisdom of the Most High, or doubt His infinite love; never did he cease to adore and worship Him. An expression of his in a dream which he records (1793), probably exhibits the sincere feeling of his heart towards the Lord. "I love Thee, even now," said he to the Saviour, whose absence he so bitterly deplored, "more than many who see Thee daily." The same spirit of humility and resignation appears in the affecting lines:

> "He wounds, and hides the hand that gave the blow;
> He flies, He reappears, and wounds again;
> Was ever heart that loved Thee treated so?
> Yet I adore Thee, though it seem in vain."

Wonderful faith! Perhaps more like that of the Syro-Phoenician woman than any record in modern biography. Mr. Newton bears valuable testimony on this subject, in a letter dated May 26, 1774: "In the beginning of his disorder, when he was more capable of conversing than he was sometime afterwards, how often have I heard him adore and submit to the sovereignty of God, and declare, though in the most agonizing and inconceivable distress, he was so perfectly satisfied of the wisdom and rectitude of the Lord's appointments, that if he was sure of relieving himself only by stretching out his hand, he would not do it, unless he was equally sure it was agreeable to His will that he should do it. I hope I shall never have so striking a proof of the integrity of any other friend, because I hope I shall never see any other in so dreadful a state of trial."

While thus walking in spiritual darkness, Cowper achieved his reputation as a poet by the publication of The Task and other poems, but after the fatal year 1772, he wrote no more

hymns except perhaps one or two for the use of the Sunday Schools in his neighbourhood. His friend Mr. Bull requested him, in 1788, to resume his labours in this respect. Nothing could be more touching than his reply: "My dear friend," he says, "ask possibilities, and they shall be performed; but ask not for hymns from a man suffering by despair as I do. I could not sing the Lord's song were it to save my life, banished as I am; not to a strange land, but to a remoteness from His presence, in comparison with which the distance from east to west is no distance—is vicinity and cohesion. I dare not, either in prose or verse, allow myself to express a frame of mind which I am conscious does not belong to me."

But his tongue has long since been unloosed; the golden harp of which he sang is in his hand; and "redeeming love" is again and forever his joyful theme. Doubtless the promise has been, at least, in part fulfilled to him. "What I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter;" and from his abode of peace and glory he seems to say to the doubting, struggling, weary ones of earth—

"Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,
But trust Him for His grace:
Behind a frowning Providence
He hides a smiling face.

His purposes will ripen fast,
Unfolding every hour;
The bud may have a bitter taste,
But sweet will be the flower.

Blind unbelief is sure to err,
And scan his work in vain:
God is His own interpreter,
And He will make it plain."

It would be interesting if our limits permitted, to notice the influence of one hymn-writer upon another, and especially to trace the connection between some of the ancient hymns of the church, and those of modern date.* There is, for instance an evident relation between Bernard's hymn, "Jesus, the very

* Many parallels may be traced also between hymns and the secular poetry in our standard literature. It was only recently that we were struck with the similarity between a portion of Addison's composition,

"The spacious firmament on high,"

and the following lines in the "Merchant of Venice:"

"Look how the floor of Heaven
Is thick inlaid with features of bright gold;
There's not the smallest orb which thou behold'st,
But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims."

thought of Thee," and Doddridge's "Jesus, I love Thy charming name," and again, Newton's, "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds." It will repay one for the trouble to read the three together, and it will be seen that while each is a distinct and independent composition, the latter productions were in all probability suggested by the former.

On the other hand, it is striking to observe the contrast between the Emperor Adrian's celebrated Apostrophe, which gives the impressions of an intelligent heathen in the prospect of death, and the odes of Pope and Toplady, both of which are entitled, "The dying Christian's Address to his Soul." (Doddridge's beautiful hymn bearing the same title, is in a different vein.) The darkness of the Emperor's doubts is not enlivened by one ray of hope:

"Ah, fleeting spirit, wandering fire,
That long hast warmed my tender breast,
Must thou no more this frame inspire,
No more a pleasing, cheerful guest?

Whither, ah whither art thou flying?
To what dark, undiscovered shore?
Thou seem'st all trembling, shivering, dying,
And wit and humour are no more!"

This is Pope's translation; and he must have had it in mind when he composed the following, to which it is a relief to turn:

"Vital spark of heavenly flame,
Quit, oh quit this mortal frame!
Trembling, hoping, lingering, flying,
Oh the pain—the bliss—of dying!
Cease, fond nature, cease thy strife,
And let me languish into life.

Hark! they whisper, angels say,
Sister spirit, come away;
What is this absorbs me quite,
Steals my senses, shuts my sight,
Drowns my spirits, draws my breath?
Tell me, my soul, can this be death?

The world recedes, it disappears;
Heaven opens on my eyes: my ears
With sounds seraphic ring;
Lend, lend your wings! I mount! I fly!
O grave, where is thy victory?
O death, where is thy sting?

Still more evangelical and full of triumphant faith and holy assurance is the ode by Toplady:

"Deathless principle arise,
Soar thou native of the skies;
Pearl of price, by Jesus bought,
To His glorious likeness wrought,
Go to shine before His throne,
Deck His mediatorial crown;
Go, His triumph to adorn;
Born of God, to God return.

Lo, He beckons from on high,
Fearless to His presence fly;
Thine the merit of His blood,
Thine the righteousness of God;
Angels joyful to attend,
Hovering round thy pillow bend;
Wait to catch the signal given,
And escort the quick to heaven.

. . . . . .

Mount their transports to improve,
Join the longing choir above,
Swiftly to their wish be given,
Kindle higher joy in heaven."

It remains for us to refer briefly to the comfort and support afforded to believers by the use of hymns in the hour of death. There are cases upon record in which the reading of a hymn has been blessed to the hopeful conversion of a sinner in his last hours; and the instances are almost numberless in which Christians have recalled hymns dear to them in time of health, to confirm their own faith, and to express to those around them their triumphant joys and hopes in the immediate prospect of dissolution. Martyrs have sung in the dreadful hour of their sufferings. Thus, we read that Jerome of Prague, on his way to the place of execution, sang several hymns. When the flames began to envelop him, he sang again, and the last words he was heard to articulate, were, "This soul in flames I offer, Christ, to Thee." And others to whom death has come with less of outward terror, have derived consolation, next to the words of holy scripture, from favourite and well-remembered hymns. Dr. Doddridge, himself one of the sweet singers of Israel, in his last sickness at Lisbon, when separated from all his relatives and Christian friends, excepting only his faithful wife, was much comforted by a volume of Watts's hymns, which he found in the house where he was staying. At the urgent solicitation of Dr. Watts, he had written the "Rise and

Progress;" to him he had dedicated it when it was published; and now, that far from home and in a foreign land, he was anticipating and preparing for his release from earth, the holy compositions of this venerated friend, who had died two years previously, must have seemed to him like the strains of ministering angels, who had been commissioned to convey him to his heavenly rest.

In the memoir of Dr. Payson, it is related that not long before his death, some of the choir of his congregation came for the purpose of singing for his gratification some of the songs of Zion. He selected the one commencing,

"Rise my soul and stretch thy wings."

part of the hymn,

"I'll praise my Maker with my breath,"

and Doddridge's hymn entitled "The Dying Christian's Address to his Soul," beginning,

"Ye golden lamps of heaven, farewell!"*

It is profitable to know what were the chosen hymns of so eminent a saint on his deathbed.

The favourite hymns of Dr. Nettleton in his last days were

"Begone, unbelief, my Saviour is near,"

by Newton, and

"Come let us join our friends above,"

by Charles Wesley. An interesting anecdote is given by Dr. Belcher, in reference to the latter of these. Some years after Charles Wesley's death, and not long before his own decease, the Rev. John Wesley being in London, officiated on a certain occasion in his own chapel in the City Road. After the morning prayers had been read he ascended the pulpit, but instead of immediately announcing the hymn to be sung, to the great

* When Goldsmith gave utterance to the lines,

"And oft I wish amid the scene to find
Some spot to real happiness consigned,
Where my worn soul, each wandering hope at rest,
May gather bliss to see my fellows blest,"

he probably did not know of the existence of the hymn referred to in the text, the last verse of which pointed to precisely such a paradise as that for which in his better moods he yearned, although lying far beyond the limits which his Traveller, "remote, unfriended, melancholy, slow," had sought to penetrate:

"There all the millions of his saints
Shall in one song unite,
And each the bliss of all shall view
With infinite delight."

surprise of the congregation, he stood silent, with his eyes closed for, it is said, at least ten minutes, wrapt in intense thought. Recovering himself, and with a feeling which at once told where his spirit had been communing, he solemnly read the hymn,

"Come let us join our friends above,
Who have obtained the prize,
And on the eagle wings of love,
To joy celestial rise."

We can easily imagine the effect this scene produced on the minds of those present who had known both the brothers.

Coincidences sometimes occur in the use of hymns, which are deserving of notice. On a Sabbath evening not many years since, a young wife transcribed the following verses from one of Bonar's hymns:

"Not first the bright, and after that the dark;
But first the dark, and after that the bright:
First the thick cloud, and then the rainbow's arc;
First the dark grave, then resurrection light.

"'Tis first the night, stern night of storm and war,
Long night of heavy clouds and veiled skies;
Then the fair sparkle of the Morning Star,
That bids the saint awake and day arise."

It was the last time she ever put pen to paper. On the following Sabbath her spirit ascended to its Saviour, leaving the body to slumber in hope until the dawn of the resurrection day. She had become a mother. The verses seemed suitable to her circumstances when she copied them, but she did not know how full of significance they would prove to be as her last written words. The copy, precious to surviving friends, was found after her death in her portfolio.

The hymn

"When from my sight all fades away,"

written by Paul Eber, a friend of Melanchthon, has long been a favourite with the dying. It is to be found unabridged in the Lyra Germanica, and commences,

"Lord Jesus Christ, true man and God."

Grotius requested that it might be repeated to him in his last moments, and died before its close. How pleasant to think of these or other stanzas, as the ascending steps by which departing saints have gone up to the presence chamber of their King.

Christian poets have not unfrequently derived comfort in

their last days and hours from their own verses. We have already alluded to the Earl of Roscommon, who died while repeating his version of the Dies Irae. George Herbert on the Sunday before he died, rose suddenly from his bed or couch, called for one of his instruments, took it into his hands, and said:

"My God, my God,
My music shall find Thee,
And every string
Shall have his attribute to sing."

And having tuned it, he played and sang from his exquisite verses on "Sunday:"

"The Sundays of man's life,
Threaded together on time's string,
Make bracelets to adorn the wife
Of the eternal, glorious king.
On Sunday heaven's gate stands ope,
Blessings are plentiful and rife,
More plentiful than hope."

"Thus," says good old Isaac Walton, "he sang on earth such hymns and anthems as the angels, and he and Mr. Farrer" (a friend who procured the publication of his sacred poems), "now sing in heaven."

We cannot forbear allusion to the death of Toplady, whose many admirable hymns enrich all our collections. "Oh," said he, one day not long before his death, "I enjoy heaven already in my soul; to me sickness is no affliction, pain no curse, death itself no dissolution; if there were not some abatement of these ecstatic joys, I could not endure the weight.'; At another time he exclaimed, "Oh the delights of the third heaven; my prayers are all converted into praise." On making his usual visit one morning, the physician found Mr. Toplady apparently much improved in health; the aspect of his case was much more encouraging. Turning to his patient he ventured to express a hope that his life might yet be prolonged. Mr. Toplady, raising his eyes flowing with rapture, while tears streamed down his cheeks, exclaimed, "No, no; I shall die; for no mortal could endure such manifestations of God's glory as I have, and live." His prediction was verified; he expired the next day singing one of his own hymns:

"Deathless principle, arise,
Soar, thou native of the skies."

"His voice faltered, his eyes closed, and scarcely had the notes died away upon his lips e'er he took up the strain again in the immediate presence of that Saviour whom he loved with an

ardour so intense, and served with a zeal so untiring." "Thus died at the early age of thirty-eight one of the brightest ornaments that ever adorned the English Church. It has been said, "the religious experience of Mr. Toplady may be compared to a sky without a cloud, and if taken from the commencement to its triumphant close, stands perhaps alone in the annals of Christian biography."

This is the record of Him who taught us to sing,

"Rock of ages cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee."

A hymn so utterly self-distrustful and so complete in its sole reliance upon the sufferings and death of Christ, could not have been composed, except under the very shadow of the cross. Had Toplady left no other legacy to the church, this single hymn would have been sufficient to endear him to us through all time; yes, and through eternity. It is pleasant to know that the late illustrious and excellent Prince Consort of England repeated this hymn constantly upon his deathbed; "For," said he, "if in this hour I had only my worldly honours and dignities to depend upon, I should be indeed poor."*

We will close with an account given by Mr. Christophers of the circumstances amid which Henry Francis Lyte, already referred to in these pages, composed his last hymn. The health of this faithful minister of the gospel had long been failing, and he had been obliged to spend the winter in Italy during several succeeding years. In 1847, as the autumn advanced, he once more made his preparations for leaving England, but he had now become so greatly reduced in strength that it seemed doubtful whether he would be able to undertake the journey. He did go, however, but he never returned. Before leaving, he wished once more to preach to his people. His family feared what the result of such an effort might be, but he gently insisted, and was able to go through with the service. He knew that he was officiating for the last time, and his

* The original prefix of this hymn given by Mr. Toplady was "A Living and Dying Prayer for the Holiest Believer in the World," and was intended to be a protest against what the author supposed to be the Wesleyan view of Christian perfection. Mr. Gladstone, the English scholar and statesman, has rendered the hymn into Latin verse. We give the first stanza:

"Jesus, pro me perforatus,
Caudar intra tuum latus,
Tu per lympham profluentem,
Tu per sanguinem tepentem,
In peccata mi redunda,
Tolle culpam, sordes munda."

sermon was full of solemn and tender appeals to those whom he had guided and instructed for many years. He administered the communion also, and then retired exhausted in body, but with his soul sweetly resting on that Saviour whom he had preached with his dying breath. As the evening drew on, he handed to a member of his family the following verses, with his own music adapted to them:

"Abide with me! fast falls the eventide,
The darkness deepens, Lord, with me abide!
When other helpers fail and comforts flee,
Help of the helpless, oh abide with me!

"Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day,
Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away;
Change and decay in all around I see;—
Oh Thou who changest not, abide with me!

"Not a brief glance I beg, a passing word,
But as Thou dwell'st with Thy disciples, Lord,
Familiar, condescending, patient, free,
Come, not to sojourn, but abide with me!

"Thou on my head in early youth didst smile,
And though rebellious and perverse meanwhile,
Thou hast not left me, oft as I left Thee;
On to the close, O Lord, abide with me!

"I need Thy presence every passing hour,
What but Thy grace can foil the tempter's power?
Who like Thyself my guide and stay can be?
Through cloud and sunshine, oh abide with me!

"I fear no foe with Thee at hand to bless,
Ills have no weight, and tears no bitterness.
Where is death's sting? Where, grave, thy victory?
I triumph still, if Thou abide with me.

"Hold then Thy cross before my closing eyes,
Shine through the gloom and point me to the skies;
Heaven's morning breaks, and earth's vain shadows flee,—
In life and death, O Lord, abide with me."

This was his last hymn on earth. He reached Nice, and shortly after his spirit entered into rest. He pointed upward as he passed away, and whispered, "Peace, joy!" Thus he went to abide forever with Him, who has declared it to be His divine will that His followers be with Him where He is, that they may behold His glory.

Art. III.—THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland, delivered in Edinburgh, in 1872. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. London: J. Murray.

Three Lectures on the Church of Scotland, with Special Reference to the Dean of Westminster's recent course on that subject. By Robert Rainy, D.D. Edinburgh: J. Maclaren.

It was not surprising that the delivery of a series of lectures on Scottish Ecclesiastical History by such a man as Dean Stanley, and on the almost sacred soil of Edinburgh, should have aroused intense interest in the minds both of Scotchmen and Englishmen. Scottish Church history is a sadly tangled skein, and every one anticipated that the well known graces of style, the chivalrous courtesy, the firm yet tender grasp with which the Dean usually handles his subjects, would operate to make these lectures most helpful in understanding and appreciating a history which embalms noble names and noble deeds which have never been surpassed in the eventful course of Christianity.

The result is painfully disappointing; it is irritating to the Scotchman that the magnificent struggles of his fathers should be depreciated and misrepresented; it is grieving to the general reader that what he hoped would be a clear transparent sketch from the hand of sanctified genius, is simply a short succession of picturesque though distorted views, given for a party purpose. The purpose is evident throughout; it was simply to impress the minds of Scotchmen that their past history had been a mistake, or a succession of mistakes. Their fathers, the Dean says, were noble men, they exhibited magnificent pluck and heroism, they invariably showed a determination which was unyielding, and their courage was often sanctified by a piety which was little less than angelic, but they magnified trifles into mountains, they avowed prejudices and called them principles, they were unreasonably set against the good things that England offered them, very much because they came from England; and after all, the best they can do still is to accept the English proffer, to become Erastian in Church government, and Latitudinarian in sentiment, and and thereby undo the mistakes of the past. And all this is said with such smiling grace, and courteous allusion, with so many

happy gestures and complimentary sketches of character dear to Scottish heart and memory, that it is almost a wonder that the Dean has not better succeeded in his purpose. The only reason why he has not succeeded better, is that it was *Scotchmen* he had to deal with. He has not succeeded, the effort has resulted in a stern repudiation of his interpretations of their history by the Scotch, and Professor Rainy has only expressed a general sentiment in his refutation, very complete and uncompromising of the Dean's positions.

We will not dwell upon the first lecture except to express an admiration of the beautiful manner in which the fragments of Early Church history are cemented together so as to form a bright view of the piety and devotedness of the patron saints of Scotland, and also to correct one or two errors into which the Dean has fallen. On page 22 he says, "That there were persons bearing the name of bishop in the earliest Christian history of Scotland is undoubted. But it is equally undoubted that they had no dioceses, no jurisdiction, no territorial episcopal succession." But it is doubted, the earliest writers on this subject in Scotland deny the statement. Stillingfleet in his "Irenicum" says, "If we may believe the antiquaries of the Church of Scotland, that church was governed by their Culdei, as they called their presbyters, for a long time. Johannes Major speaks of their instruction in the faith, "per sacerdotes et monachos sine episcopis Scoti in fide eruditi." And lest this should be understood only of their conversion, Johannes Fordonnus is clear and full as to their government from the time of their conversion, about A.D., 263, to the coming of Palladius, A.D., 430, that "they were only governed by presbyters and monks." So that at all events it is not a question beyond doubt or dispute as Dr. Stanley intimates. The following sentence on page 42, is also open to serious question:—"John Knox had as little belief in the paramount and divine character of Presbyterianism as Cranmer had in the paramount and divine character of Episcopacy. So far from shunning connexion with the English Church, he eagerly sought to fortify its friendly relations with the Church of Scotland; so far from regarding the contact with Prelacy as a soul destroying abomination, almost his last signature, 'with a dead hand but with a glad heart,' is subscribed beneath the name of the Archbishop of St. Andrews." This statement is misleading. John Knox had contended strenuously against the restoration of the Episcopal office for years, he did hold that under certain circumstances a church might commit to some ministers the power to inspect congregations

within a given district, but he never allowed any class of officers superior in order or office to ministers and presbyters. On Sunday, February 13th, 1872, the last year of his life, he preached at St. Andrews, and the Earl of Morton desired him afterwards to inaugurate Douglas as Archbishop of St. Andrews. He refused and pronounced an anathema against both the donor and receiver of the bishopric. He was reproached with being disappointed that the office had not been given to him, but be at once referred to his having previously refused a bishopric in the English Church, offered by King Edward VI. In the General Assembly held at St. Andrews in the following month, he not only entered a protest against the election of Douglas, but also "opposed himself directly to the making of bishops." As to his signature standing next to the Archbishop's, it is enough to observe that a sermon was preached before the General Assembly, at Leith, by David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline, and that Knox with the Archbishop and others were requested to examine and approve it, previous to publication. So little can his signature merely standing in juxta-position to that of Douglas be construed into an approval of Episcopacy.

Not more reliable is Dr. Stanley's statements that in the age succeeding the Reformation, Presbyterianism and Episcopacy "flourished in closest contact with each other," and that the General Assembly "continued to sit side by side with the hierarchy of James VI." It is true that the two systems were brought into close contact in the reigns of James I. and Charles I. But it was because Episcopacy was set up by the Crown, which whilst strong enough to establish it, was not strong enough to expel Presbyterianism, and therefore both were allowed to exist together for a time, until sufficient headway had been made to banish the Scotch system and completely maintain the English one. If the forced co-existence of two alien parties can be construed into a friendly and tolerant interchange then we must attach new meaning to words, because the Presbyterians suffered the presence of the Episcopacy because it was forced upon them, and the king, with his bishops, only endured the Presbyterians because they dared not to thrust them out. Equally mistaken is the Dean when he tells us that Prelacy was called "black," because the Episcopal ministers wore black gowns, whereas the Presbyterian ministers wore blue cloaks and broad bonnets. This Dr. Rainy stoutly denies,—he says, p. 12, "Let the Dean be assured that no Presbyterian minister ever troubled his head whether the cloak he preached in was black or blue. Disputes

about the colour of vestments in which the Gospel is to be preached do not belong to our parish. We have never been civilised enough to understand them. We had other reasons tolerably strong for calling Prelacy black."

But we must pass on from this first lecture which has detained us too long, but which offers a field for much enlarged remark. We will only say further that the names supplied by Dr. Stanley as the most cherished names of the Scotch Episcopal Church, are as damaging as its worst foes could have wished. They are, Mary Queen of Scots, Claverhouse, and Prince Charles Edward. No doubt romance embalms them, and sheds round the name of the last especially a charm which school boys will readily acknowledge, but in Church history we cannot be guided by poetry or romance, we *must* confine ourselves to fact, and the facts in relation to these so called saints are such as may lead us to wish them forgotten rather than remembered.

In the second lecture the Dean treats of the Church of Scotland in relation to the Covenant and to the minute divisions into which it has been separated, meaning by the Church of Scotland the great Presbyterian Community of the North. The first feature adverted to, is the intense spirit of national independence manifested in Scottish Ecclesiastical history.

"It is this antique splendour which casts a halo round the Scottish struggle for independence, even when we least approve of it. It was magnificent in the struggle of John Knox against all the fascinations of Queen Mary. It was magnificent in the struggle of Andrew Melville against James VI. It was magnificence even if somewhat grotesque in the struggle of the whole people against Laud and Charles I. It was magnificent in the still more fiery struggle of the Covenanters against Claverhouse and Lauderdale. It was magnificent when, passing over into the Episcopalian Church, it strove against William III., at Killiecrankie, or against George II. at Prestonpans and Culloden."—p. 63.

"All honour to Scottish Churchmen for the stubbornness of their fight, their devotion of themselves, not only to death, but at times even to absurdity, for what were deemed the rights of conscience and the sacredness of truth and the glory of Scotland."—p. 65.

But now comes the other side, as presented by our author, and astounded would these magnificent old worthies be if they could arise and read the volume before us. In the first place the Dean affirms that the struggles of the Scottish Church were of an "almost entirely negative character."—p. 65. If ever there was a history intensely and directly positive it was

that of the Scottish Church in its prolonged struggles. Doubtless it indulged in denials of what it believed to be errors in doctrine and discipline, but very often it is impossible to give a sufficiently positive expression of a belief without negativing opposite opinions. The white heat of emotion to which the Scotch nature rose, proves *prima facie,* the positiveness of their convictions. Mere negations never inspire men to be martyrs and heroes. The Confession of John Knox which lies at the foundation of future Covenants and Confessions is an intense assertion of the leading doctrines of Scripture. The Covenant of 1580, which is called "a negative Confession" is as strong an affirmation of positive belief as men could make and was only equalled by the famous "solemn League and Covenant" which became the watch-word of the greatest struggle of the nation. At the bottom of many negations in which Scotchmen indulged against Arianism, Erastianism, Socinianism, Arminianism, and many other isms, equally abhorrent to Scottish minds, there lay always the clear, strong, well-defined doctrines of Calvin, and the equally well-understood principles of presbyterian polity. Throughout the whole of the history there is nothing more evident than that the conflicts were those of a people who knew what they were fighting for, and who had principles to preserve which were dearer to them than life.

The Dean next refers to these great struggles as being very much an out-growth of the independence of the Scottish nature, and adduces the rejection of the English Liturgy in 1637 as an instance of this.

"What the result was in St. Giles's 'Church on that fatal day when the black, popish and superstitious book,' as it was called, was opened by the unfortunate Dean of Edinburgh, can hardly be imagined in these more peaceful days. 'Wolf,' 'crafty fox,' 'son of a witch,' 'false Judas,' were the epithets with which the Prelates who assisted were 'mightily upbraided;' and had they been actually all these things, they could hardly have been worse treated. . . . The two special incidents which figure in all versions of the tumult under different forms, deserve a more particular notice.

"The first was when 'the old herb woman' hearing the Archbishop who watched the rubric direct the Dean to read the collect for the day, gathered up her indignation in the well-known exclamation, confounding 'cholic' with 'collect' and discharged at the Dean's head the famous stool, which he escaped by 'jowking,' but gave the signal for a universal discharge of the liked famed stools of the ladies or their waiting maids throughout the Church. Had they waited till the Dean had read the collect, it is possible that they might even then have changed their minds."

"The other incident was apparently later in the day, when 'a good

Christian woman' who, unable to escape from the church after its door was closed to quell the disturbance, had retired to the farthest corner to be beyond reach of the hateful service, and who then hearing, as she thought, the 'mass sang in her lug,' turned round on the offender and 'shot against him the thunderbolt of her zeal, and warmed both his cheeks with the weight of her hands.' The dreadful provocation which called for this explosion was, that 'a young man sitting behind her began to sound forth, Amen!'"—pp. 70, 72.

After this riot followed a revolution which eventuated in our freedom and in the overthrow of the monarchy.

"No doubt," says the Dean, "the exasperation had its root in the indomitable native vigour of which we have been speaking. But the intrinsic slightness of the incidents which roused it is the best proof of the force of the feeling."—p. 72. Will anyone believe that this is a full statement of the cause of that wondrous movement? Fanatical, independent, unreasoning, impulsive, as we may suppose the Scotch to have been, 1000 young men might have said "Amen" in corners, and none would have interfered with them, if that had been all, and all the Bishops and Deans of Christendom might have read their beautiful collects in peace, if there had been nothing further involved in it. But the reading of the Liturgy in St. Giles's was only one step in a series, it was a part of a deliberately and determinately prepared scheme to force upon the Scotch the Book of Canons and a Book of Prayer, and such a Prayer Book as that the English one was pronounced by competent judges to be far preferable, By these books provision was made for destroying the Presbyterian Church, and for exalting the Bishops to supremacy in the Church. Moreover, they pronounced all excommunicated who affirmed that the Liturgy contained aught contrary to Scripture, or who denied the authority of the Bishops. All this too was done without the existing Scottish Church being consulted or considered, it was an attempt to revolutionize completely the worship of a nation, under a Romanising agency which the people abhorred.

It was not simply, therefore, a piece of characteristic national stubbornness; it was a stern resistance offered by the people to an outrage upon their religious liberties, and in defence of their most cherished religious principles. The commencement of the opposition was not dignified perhaps,—it may seem even ridiculous to some that a national revolution should commence with a woman of the lower orders slapping a young man's cheeks in church, but it was the instructive and inevitable explosion of wrath which had been roused beyond

endurance, by a tyranny which was not only unwarrantable but silly. The people who checked this at once should not be laughed at, they are worthy of honour that so promptly they recognised the evil and uprooted it. The occasions might be small, but the principle at stake was great; the accidents might seem frivolous, but the rationale of the quarrel was fundamental to the life and happiness of the nation.

The Dean draws a fine and affecting picture of the signing of the National Covenant in 1638, and also of the reception of it in St. Margaret's Church, in London, when it had grown into "The Solemn League and Covenant." But again he seems to believe that the mighty movement was disproportioned to the occasion, and was but a fiery and uncontrollable outburst of party real. To this Professor Rainy replies with characteristic force and liveliness.

"There was the deepest conviction in men's minds that the course of things which had been submitted to in the past was fraught with intolerable mischief. The Crown forcing on, and the Church dubiously and unwillingly submitting to arrangements which the Church judged unscriptural and unedifying. This was a state of things in itself wrong and demoralising, leading to a moral paralysis of the Church's best energies, and sure to multiply inward division and distrust. Moreover, it was becoming plain that no one could tell to what results the process might be forced on. Men knew very well that in making a stand the risks might be great, and that the odds must be heavy. But having for a moment the opportunity to breathe free air, and to utter common convictions and resolves, it was a grand impulse which led them to join together, and to pledge themselves to one another in a common recognition of this, as a duty to God, that the system they had known should end, and that what they agreed in regarding as destitute of Scripture warrant, should henceforth, as far as their power extended, be shut out and kept out. In time past they finessed and faltered, and had halted between two opinions. They had felt the effect of that. Now, henceforward, they would keep a clean conscience, and walk straight upon principle agreed upon by all. Lower motives mingled with the higher no doubt. For all that it was grand impulse. In the thrill that went through Scotland the bulk of the nation felt itself one, as it perhaps never did before or since. We have the testimony of an enemy as to 'the great joy' with which through burgh and land the Covenant was signed by all kinds of people. Surely it is a striking thing that what so united the nation was a resolution that God's authority discerned by themselves in His Word: that and nothing else should set up institutions in their Church. That principle was written then on the fibre of the Scottish people in a manner that is legible enough yet. May it never be obliterated."

It might be a mistake to endeavour to carry the Covenant out in England, but the temptation to get rid of Prelacy and Popery by a firm set and united effort was very powerful, and the mistake lay perhaps more in the work being beyond the strength of those who undertook it, rather than in anything else. It *was* too much to be accomplished then, and there arose sad intricacies and entanglements, and from these sad agonising sufferings in which the blood was spilt of hearts which beat with the noblest loyalty to the cause of Christ. "Honour," says Dr. Stanley, "to those Scottish Churchmen for the stubbornness of their fight, for their devotion of themselves, not only to death, but even at times to absurdity"—p. 65. But we cannot see the absurdity; mistaken in their means they may sometimes have been, but at the groundwork of the conflict lay the most important principles of Christian Church life, and these were souls who passionately and fiercely clung to those enduring principles of right.

The third feature of the Scottish struggles on which the Dean dilates, is the "littleness and minuteness of the points on which its religious divisions have taken place." As an instance of this, he cites the great Disruption of 1843, and concerning this he says, "There was no other country in the world where so noble a testimony could have been borne to the sacredness and tenderness of scrupulous consciences. But it is no less true that in no other country in the world would the consciences of so many able and excellent men have been so deeply wounded by the intricacies of a legal suit, of which the point at issue can only be ascertained by a searching investigation of conflicting statements, even amongst those who are most keen in the controversy," p. 75. It is scarcely possible to think of any sentence which is more erroneous. In modern times no religious movement has been better understood or more universally admired. The principle in question can be grasped by the simplest peasant. Therefore, Dr. Rainy pertinently asks:—

"Is this unintelligible out of Scotland, that we refuse as a Church to take it as part of our duty, to form, or profess to form, the pastoral tie between pastor and people, merely on the ground that a civil court bids us; that we refuse in like manner to fulfil or forbear any purely spiritual act on the mere ground of the same authority; that when it turned out that the terms of Establishment, in the view of the State, imported an obligation in point of duty to obey such decrees, the Free Church saved her honesty by renouncing the pay and privileges for which she could not fulfil the terms? Why the whole world understood it; many parts of the world are feeling the effects of it now!"

This one instance will show that the Dean's representations of the causes of Scottish divisions must not be depended upon for accuracy; others might be given, but we have but little space left for what we intended to be the major part of our work. We cannot pass from the second lecture however without pausing for one moment to speak of the beautifully graceful and touching sketch of the sainted Samuel Rutherford, with which the lecture closes. *O! si sic omnia.* Had it been so how different a notice of these lectures we had rejoiced to pen; we know no language in which we could have sufficiently expressed our admiration.

The third lecture is entitled "The moderation of the Church of Scotland." During the eighteenth century there was a race of divines in the Scottish Established Church called the "Moderates" who, indeed, composed the majority of the Assembly, and who had the administration of the Church in their hands. They were a sad race of men, many of them were Socinian in sentiment, more of them were immoral in practice. There were great names amongst them, representing high literary excellence and great learning, John Home, the author of "Douglas," Hugh Blair, the well-known sermon-writer and lecturer on "Rhetoric," William Robertson, the historian of America and Scotland, and others of lesser fame, but of distinguished excellence; but there was not one of the whole school distinguished for pious zeal or evangelical doctrine. The prevailing spirit and temper of the moderates may be best set forth by one or two anecdotes which we extract from the *Contemporary Review* for March, p. 456:

"There is an unspeakably touching story handed down by tradition in Ayrshire of Burns, when quite a young man, having been visited, we know not how, by that sudden consciousness of sin and despairing aspiration after a higher life which comes once in a lifetime to many a man. He went, it is said, with his 'convictions' to the minister of the parish where he happened to be, 'a moderate' of excellent character, who heard all he had to say, and gave it as his advice to him not to trouble himself about these feelings—to 'go to the first penny wedding he could find and think no more about it." Dr. Smith, the venerable minister of Kilmarnock, well remembered Dr. M'Gill, a man of great learning, and the chief of the Socinianizing Presbyterians. When Dr. S. was a young man he had to lecture and pray before the Presbytery of Ayr as a candidate for the ministry. He knew they were nearly all Socinians, and as a young man he looked up to his judges with great timidity. His views were Puritan and Orthodox, and

he felt strongly urged, not wholly to deny them, but to avoid expressing them distinctly even in his public prayer. In the mental struggle his conscience was victorious, and he prayed as he believed. Dr. M'Gill sent for him next day, and stretching out his right hand, with a steadfast look, put to him the question, "young man do you believe what you said yesterday?" He answered in the affirmative, quaking a little; and the Doctor emphatically replied, "I pity you—good bye." A sad evil race were these "Moderates," of whom Hugh Miller said, "they robed themselves in the habiliments of unbelief, but took the liberty of lacing it with Bible edgings;" they did not believe the orthodox creed, but they had no hesitation in signing it, and under their influence piety drooped, immorality prevailed, and their days may be called "the dark days" of Scottish Church history.

But, strange to say, this school is held up by Dean Stanley as being worthy of chief admiration, and the Established Church of Scotland is lauded for having given a home to these men in her bosom. "It is in the Established Church that these eminent men found their home. The narrower spirits of the age took refuge in one seccession after another," p. 129. Elsewhere the Dean speaks of this "Moderatism" as "a great philosophic virtue and evangelical grace," and treats this school as exemplifying the advice of the apostle "let your moderation be known unto all men," p. 115. Scotchmen have a right to complain that in treating of this sad race of men Dr. Stanley has selected from the previous history of the Church a few great men of Catholic spirit and broad charity, and presented them as being the forerunners of the "Moderates." The first of these is Robert Douglas, twice moderator of the Scottish Church in the 17th century. All that can be said of our author about him is that he was a prudent man, opposed to extreme measures in Church discipline, and friendly with his opponents. On the other hand, as Dr. Rainy points out, he was soundly evangelical in his teaching; he believed firmly in the Scriptural authority of Presbyterianism, in the human origin of prelacy, and he was a steadfast upholder of the Covenant. A wide contrast here between him and the "Moderates."

The next name adduced is that of the noble and saintly Leighton. It *is* true that he concerned himself little with the questions then debated on Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, but surely that is not sufficient ground on which to assume him to be a forerunner of the "Moderates" of the last century. Ah! dear Archbishop Leighton, through whose writings there

runs the clear translucent stream of godliness as though a rill from the pure river of the water of life had escaped to earth and meandered from his pen. His life was one of upright integrity, his character of lofty holiness, in him there was an overflow of that rich piety which was the greatest lack of the "Moderates," and a free declaration of those truths which they negatived in their teaching. Indeed Coleridge ranks Leighton with Davenant, Sanderson, Hall, and Ussher as being bulwarks against the latitudinarianism that otherwise might have prevailed. Not more successful is Dr. Stanley in claiming William Cartairs, one of the brightest ornaments of the Scottish Church, as a "Moderate," but we cannot dwell on this.

The leading characteristics of the "Moderate" party were, a disposition to pass over the points which had been most strongly contested in previous days, a strong craving for intellectual culture which had been much neglected, and which, indeed, the Scottish clergy had had little opportunity to cultivate on account of the stern conflicts which had absorbed their energies, and a habit of dwelling almost exclusively on the moral elements in religion, rather than in preaching Christ and Him crucified. These were the general characteristics of the school, if we look more closely it becomes a painful study. The race is photographed in the pages of Alexander Carlyle of Inveresk, and a more sad picture of ministerial laxity and of weak religious sentiment, is not to be found outside of the Roman Catholic Church. Dr. Rainy speaks strongly but truly when he thus sums up the spirit and issue of Moderatism: "The history of Moderatism, what it began with and what it ended in, the pretensions of its rise and the undisguised baseness of its latter end, is a great historical commentary on the results in Christian churches of setting the secondary interests in the primary place. It is, in one word, ruin," p. 83.

It is not difficult to understand Dr. Stanley's approval of Moderatism. His repeatedly expressed convictions that the Church should ally itself to the widest variety of religious opinion are familiar enough, and it is not wonderful that whilst he admires the splendid endurance of Scottish martyrs, he should pity them because they knew no better than to suffer so much for what was not worth the expenditure. It is strange to contrast his treatment of Scotch martyr heroes with his strong effort to prove David Hume a christian character. Of course we believe Hume to have been an amiable and kindly man, but to claim him as a christian because he attended church, because some of the "moderate" ministers made him a companion, and because he spoke prudently on the great doc-

trines of religion is not convincing, and we believe with Dr. Rainy that it requires faith in Jesus Christ to constitute a man a christian.

The fourth and concluding lecture is on "The present and the future of the Church of Scotland." We cannot remark on the dean's hopeful treatment of the subject of union in the Scotch churches; we can only speak of a few succeeding details. We have presented in the dean's best style sketches of Dr. Chalmers, Dr. John Duncan, Edward Irving, and Thomas Erskine, of Linlathen. They are written with all the overflow of generous appreciation, which is so beautiful a feature of the dean's writing when he is treating of personal character and not of Church questions; and in reading them one is only sorry that the writer has made use of a few kindly words spoken by Chalmers in appreciation of the Oxford University to reflect upon what he deems the narrower spirit of many who use his name. Surely the Free Church does not contain a man who would not as freely utter the simple sentence Dr. Stanley quotes to exalt the charity of the noble Scotchman and to depreciate that of his religious confreres,—"You have the best machinery in the world, and you know not how to use it."

In this lecture the dean quotes Robert Burns and Sir W. Scott as representative Scottish Churchmen, "completely Scottish Churchmen in the largest sense;" and again he says, "each of these great men represents the several tendencies of which I have spoken, the romantic, the independent, and the moderate attitude of the Scottish Church. And each justifies his title to be considered not only as a poet but as a prophet—not only as a delightful companion but as a wise religious teacher"—p. 162. Now the question is not one as to the genius of these men, nor as to the exquisite poetic beauty of the poems of Robert Burns. No doubt he does offer a graceful tribute at the shrine of religion in the "Cottar's Saturday Night," he does forcibly urge the practice of morality in his "Advice to a young man," and few lines in our literature are more pathetic than his prayer for the christian household by whom he had been entertained. No doubt, moreover, his soul had a deep loathing of all cant, and that he was honest and open as the day in the very texture of his nature; but all this does not make him a Christian, and is no ground on which he should be reckoned as a prominent Christian teacher in the Church, especially when we remember how his own life was stained by disgraceful excesses, and how likewise he employed his genius in behalf of the Moderate party in the Church, and

rained down floods of contemptuous satire upon the minority who contended for religious purity and sound doctrine. It is a pity to say these things, but the responsibility must rest with those who over praise the wayward poet and make it necessary to speak the truth concerning him. As little can Sir W. Scott be considered a great religious teacher in the Church, but as Dr. Stanley says this would require a volume to treat of, we may refer our readers to Dr. McCrie's review of "Tales of my Landlord" upon this subject.

Dr. Stanley closes his lectures by dwelling on the future of the Church of Scotland, and strongly advocates in relation to it the position he has long advocated in the English Church in favour of relaxed terms of subscription and greater latitudinarianism of belief. That the Scotch Church has need of a wider charity, of greater generosity of spirit, of a less dogmatic expression of opinion, we can readily believe, but to give up its positive belief in cardinal doctrines to become again "Moderate," after the fashion of the last century, would be a moral disaster to the world, and would expose the Churchmen of Scotland to enduring shame. There is no fear of this consummation. Dr. Rainy, we believe, speaks the truth when he says:—

"Just in so far as the Established Churches correspond to the dean's ideal, and in so far as that becomes clear, we will most certainly join with all our might to pull them down. More than that there are plenty of men in the Established Churches who, on that supposition, will overcome the temptation of their position and come to help us. Churches of that kind, if they are to be called churches, are a moral nuisance not to be tolerated for an hour. I mean churches in which the whole power, the whole means of attraction which the State can employ, is devoted to support the principle that the Church of Christ, as such, has no principle and no conscience—has no peremptory assertions to make, no distinct truth, and no distinct life to represent and embody to the world. It would be treason to Christianity itself to connive at this for an hour."—p. 89.

Our task is done. We are compelled to write the lectures of Dr. Stanley a failure. They fail to represent Scottish Church history, or to appreciate the spirit of those giants who were the leaders in the great conflicts; they are simply an apology for erastianism and latitudinarianism as applied to the Scotch Church, and we are sorry that such courtly grace, such charms of style, such geniality of spirit, and such a power of picturesque grouping should have been employed for such a purpose. They have not succeeded with Scotchmen, the old

habit of realism which enabled John Knox to defy the blandishments of Queen Mary, has enabled his spiritual successors to refuse to dance to Dr. Stanley's charming, though he charmed with exquisite skill. The lectures of Professor Rainy go to the very root of the great questions stirred up, and in the onset between the Englishman and the Scotchman the southerner has bitten the dust. W. J. T.

Art. IV.—POPULAR PREACHING.

Popular preaching may be understood to indicate either the preaching that is for the good of the people or the preaching that is to the taste of the people, and so on one or both of these grounds secures their attention and approval. As a rule all preaching should be popular; it should be a preaching to the people and for the people; addressed both in intention and adaptation to the many and not to the few.

This is the New Testament idea of preaching, and hence it draws a distinction between preaching and teaching. By some modern sects this distinction is still attempted in the arrangement of the public services, the morning service being appropriated to the Church, the evening to the promiscuous congregation. This distinction is also recognised virtually if not formally by some ministers in all denominations. The morning service is made one of instruction mainly, and conducted specially for believers, or those who have openly decided for Christ. To them the minister seeks to unfold the meaning of God's word, that by their reception of it and meditation upon it they may be strengthened in their Christian life, and may be brought nearer to God in their consciousness of His presence, and their meetness for His fellowship. The evening ministration is considered to be more for the unconverted and undecided, and this determines not only the topics spoken upon but the way in which they are treated. The instructive style passes somewhat into the declamatory, the expository into the exhortative, while the composition is rhetorical, and the delivery oratorical, to a greater degree than is allowable when feeding the Church with the pure milk of the word, or strong meat of doctrine, is the chief object sought. It is of preaching properly

understood that we wish to make a few remarks in this paper.

And first we reiterate what we have already affirmed—for its importance will justify the repetition—that all true preaching should be popular, that is it should be adapted to arrest the attention of the people at large, and not merely some particular sections or classes of them. We glory in the belief that Jesus Christ tasted death for every man, that the Holy Spirit is sent into the hearts of all mankind to draw them to God, and that our Heavenly Father will cast none out who come to Him. Our preaching of the Gospel should be in harmony with this belief. We, to whom the ministry of it is committed, have to be workers together with God by setting His gospel before all men in a way adapted to their intelligence and habits of thought.

In speaking of the elements of a truly popular style of preaching this is the first we will name—intelligibility. It must be a preaching that can be 'understanded of the common people.' The writer once visited a sick woman who could not speak the English language, and he conversed with her through an interpreter. When asked if he should pray before he left, her reply was, "O yes, the influence will be the same if I cannot understand what he says." This remark, however, can hardly be applied to preaching. A discourse in Latin or Greek would not be very popular to an English audience, even if it were delivered with all the fire and dramatic action of Father Gavazzi. Or, if we could suppose such preaching in an unknown tongue to be popular, the popularity would be worthless alike to the preacher and his audience, for it would reduce preaching to the position of being an amusement only, or a means by which sensations of a pleasurable kind are communicated to us. Intelligibleness must, therefore, be kept in view by every one who aspires to be a popular preacher. This condition applies to his own intellectual conceptions; he must be a clear thinker. Confusion in thought makes intelligibleness of communication an impossibility. But the thought being clear and well defined, cut out from the general quarry of thought—if we may be allowed the illustration—and grasped in its entirety, it must be clothed in suitable language. It is possible for a public speaker to use the English language, and yet what he says shall be, to a great degree, unintelligible to those who are listening to him. The vocabulary of the people generally is very limited, and consists chiefly of words that are simple in their composition. We believe this to be so to a greater extent than many imagine. The writer was once surprised by being told that the poor women who sat on the free

seats liked his preaching, only they could not understand many of the words he used. At first he thought this was said in playfulness, until assured to the contrary. Though reluctant to admit the fact, perhaps our informant was right, for we have met with many exemplifications of the word ignorance of those we should never have suspected being in that condition. We remember preaching a sermon to the young in which the word "paradoxical" was used. After service we went home with a gentleman who was the owner of a large library, and, we believe, a great reader too. He commended the sermon he had heard, but feared the word "paradoxical" was one that the young people generally would not understand, adding, he should not have known the meaning of it himself but for the connection in which it occurred. Another person once said to us, "If I were a preacher I should pay particular attention to the explaining of words to the people, for I am fully convinced that preachers use a great many that the people do not understand, or to which they affix a very vague meaning." We hesitated to endorse that opinion. "Well," he replied, "I reason this way: I presume I know the meaning of words as well as the ordinary run of people, and I confess I scarcely hear a sermon but some word or words in it are out of my line of knowledge. If it is so with me, I presume it is much more so with those whose time is chiefly taken up with working for their living." A week or two after this conversation we were coming out of the chapel this gentleman attended, and while at his side we were respectfully accosted by a person who had been at the service, and asked if he might be allowed to inquire the meaning of a word used in the sermon, for he had never to his knowledge heard it before, and he liked to understand the sermons he listened to. The word which perplexed this inquirer was "precocious," and of course at the dinner table our friend improved the occasion to reiterate and enforce the views he had expressed so recently.

But is understandable preaching popular preaching? Well, with some, perhaps not. We have more than once heard persons say, after hearing some preacher of fame, or one to whose name was appended the letters D.D., "I don't think so much of him, for I could readily understand all he said." There is a story told, and has been heard probably by most of our readers, of an old woman who, on returning from hearing a minister she greatly admired one Sunday, fervidly exclaimed, "Ah, he is a blessed man! he gets better and better. Every time I hear him I understand him less, and soon he will be so grand I shall not understand him at all." This old lady's idea of ex-

cellence evidently was that it was attained to in proportion as the sermon surpassed her intelligence, and for uncultivated minds generally grandiloquence is not without its charms. To many among the common people the using of long and sonorous words is a great recommendation. It awakens their sense of wonder. What a clever man he must be to be able to use such language! is their reflection, and they open their eyes and ears and take the preacher for a nonsuch for the amount of knowledge he possesses. We have met with many amusing illustrations of this in the Black Country among the miners and iron workers. But the taste for this sort of thing is not confined to one district of our island, or one class of our countrymen, to some extent it exists everywhere. Still this kind of popularity is very factitious. It is not worth seeking after, nor having; and no right-minded preacher would have it in view for a moment. Besides it is popularity with a class only, and a class which will diminish as intelligence and correct taste prevail. A preacher who seeks popularity in such a way does as silly a thing as a painter would who drew a picture in lurid colours because those who gazed upon it thought nothing was grand that was not glaring.

It may then be assumed that the first element of popular preaching—that is, of popularity on the widest basis, and of the truest and most lasting character—is intelligiblity of language, the use of a vocabulary free from uncommon, technical, and scientific terms. We had almost added theological terms as well, for we fear many of these are as little understood as if they were terms from a foreign language, which indeed they generally are. For instance, what meaning can ninety-nine out of the hundred in our congregations affix to Original Sin, Federal headship of Adam, the Eternal generation of the Son of God, the Trinity, and such like terms.

The second requirement for popular preaching is that it should be true to human nature and human life. In other words, it should not be too heedful of the distinctions and gradations of society, but apply to the being we have in common irrespective of these arbitrary and artificial divisions. We are told of our Lord that the common people heard Him gladly; that is, not the low, vulgar people as some would understand the word to mean, but the main body of the people, the multitude, in opposition to the *elite*, the refined, the aristocratic, the rich. And why the common people were so glad to hear Christ is not difficult to explain. It arose partly from the fact that His sermons had the element of popularity of which we have been speaking. How simple was His language!

How free from technical and theological terms! Hard and uncommon words rarely occur in His addresses, and never except by necessity, no other being so suitable to give His meaning. The people were spoken to in their own tongue, wherein they were born; and the style of the address was as simple as the language employed. No grandiloquence, no high flown rhetoric, no straining for effect marked the Great Teacher's preaching. But He was also gladly heard because the subjects He spoke upon were subjects in which they had the deepest interest, subjects which came home to their business and bosoms, applied to their real circumstances and experiences; they knew, they felt, that their truest happiness and well-being were bound up with them.

And at the present day a preacher who would be popular in the first sense of the word, must in these respects imitate our Lord. His sermons must not be the discussion of some abstract truth, or the exposition of abstruse doctrine, not philosophical disquisitions, or professorial harangues, but the addresses of a man who knows the heart that beats in the breast of his fellowman, knows how it is affected by his surroundings and the inevitable occurrences of every-day life, and who can speak words of sympathy, and counsel, and encouragement, and comfort, yea, and words of admonition and warning too, as those who are listening to him may require. We do not say that abstract truth, and doctrine strictly so called, should never be expounded or discussed in the pulpit—at fitting times and seasons they undoubtedly ought to be—but preaching generally should be practical and appropriate to the actual condition of the audience; adapted to cheer them in the sorrows they feel, guide them in the perplexities with which they are visited, strengthen them under the burdens they have to bear, fit them for the duties they have to perform, or preserve them from the dangers and evils to which they are exposed.

It is alleged that there is a want of adaptation on the part of a great deal, if not of the most, of preaching at the present day, and that to this must be attributed in a great degree the scanty attendance at our churches and chapels so much complained of The allegation has some truth in it, though we do not believe it is so widely true as is supposed. A Unitarian minister in our great northern sea-port, under this conviction, gave lately a course of sermons or addresses out of his own church —in a secular room if we may be allowed the expression—on Sunday evenings, on Christianity in Common Life. Christianity in Common Life we have long been convinced should be the almost constant theme of the preacher in the sanctuary,

but after reading the addresses referred to, we would say let us take care that it is a true and vital Christianity that we thus apply. Having the form of godliness but denying the power thereof, is an error to be avoided, not a rule to walk by; and if the doctrines of grace, as they are called, and a spiritual experience are to be eliminated from our Christianity, then we may say of it, The body without the spirit is dead. And we are thankful to add that, as yet, to ignore man's sinful character and state, his necessity of forgiveness and spiritual renewal to qualify him to live to God and in fellowship with Him, and, therefore, to omit repentance and conversion, and the witness of the Spirit, from our preaching, and keep exclusively to the ethical and social character of Christ's religion is not the way to popularity in preaching.

Wesley and his coadjutors were popular preachers because they pursued just a reverse course to this. They began with the spiritual, and in a sense with the doctrinal, and from that beginning worked on to the ethical and social. The order Christ prescribed was the order they followed, "Make the tree good and then the fruit will be good, for men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles." But let it be remembered they did go on to the ethical and social. No one at all acquainted with Wesley's life and labours can doubt that Methodism is essentially a practical religion as it came from the hands of its founder. It was not a rigidly defined or sharply cut creed of the Athanasian stamp, nor a mere spiritual phantasm of the Antinomian kind, but a divine life taken into all human relationships, and human duties, and human trials. It was not simply a desire to flee from the wrath to come, but that desire in fruition, taking effect by the production of a life in which there was a ceasing to do evil and a learning to do well.

Still we admit the modern successors of Mr. Wesley do not tread in his steps in this respect so fully as they should. An Octogenarian spoke to the writer of having heard a celebrated Wesleyan minister preach a sermon on truthfulness. He said, "I went and thanked him, for though I had been a Methodist sixty years I had never heard a sermon on Truthfulness from our pulpit before;" and he went on to regret that the virtues of the Christian character were not oftener, and in a more full and direct manner, dwelt on in preaching. "We have too much doctrinal preaching," a Wesleyan once said to us, "it is all of that kind. Repentance and faith, forgiveness and assurance are the themes continually dwelt upon. I have never heard a sermon from our pulpit bringing home religion

to my every day life, telling me how I could best perform my duties as a citizen, or the father of a family."

In the primary sense of the expression such preaching would be truly popular, it would be preaching to the wants of the people; but whether it would be popular in the secondary sense, that is in the sense of being to the taste of the people so as to draw them in large numbers to hear it, may be questioned.

Jay, of Bath, in his autobiography, tells a story of a minister who began a course of lectures to his congregation on the Epistle to the Ephesians. While on the former part of the Epistle his lectures were highly appreciated and well attended, but when he passed from the doctrinal to the ethical portion, and began to discuss the duties of the Christian in his social relations the charm was gone, and his deacons waited upon him to suggest the propriety of bringing the course to a close.

Another element of popular preaching relates to what is called style, which includes both the composition and delivery of the sermon. That is not popular that is abstruse, metaphysical, or hard to be understood, however excellent the matter may be in itself. An argumentative preacher again is rarely popular, or one that is eloquent after the classical style. Classical literature, music, or painting—that is the literature, music, or painting formed according to the principles of high art, or art in its highest state of excellence as understood by the thoroughly educated—can scarcely be called popular. And so it is in public speaking, whether in the Lecture Hall or the Church. Long, complicated, and nicely balanced sentences do not go down as a rule. At the present day especially something of the free-and-easy fashion is run after, and run after we fear more than is good for either the taste or the piety of the multitude. A general canon on the subject of style may be given thus—preach in a style that is adapted to command attention, that will retain attention when gained, and that also will repay attention. To do this it need not be of any particular type or order, it is sufficient that it have a few leading features to serve this object.

Some preachers have recourse to artifice to secure attention when they fail to gain it in an ordinary way. The first time we heard Mr. Spurgeon preach, for a moment or two after he had taken his text, we thought we were going to be disappointed. The first few sentences he uttered produced no effect, hardly arrested attention at all, when he abruptly stopped in the middle of a sentence, and with changed tone and manner said, "Away with these formal introductions; they were only devised by some one who wished to speak

against time; let us go to our subject at once." This sent an electric shock through the vast congregation, there was a universal waking up, and from that moment he had not a listless hearer. We thought all this was done on the impulse of the moment, but saying that to a minister once he smiled at our simplicity, declaring that it was a rhetorical or oratorical device on the part of the preacher. The following incident may perhaps confirm that opinion.

On his first visit to a Midland town all the dissenting ministers of the town were invited by the gentleman whose guest he was to take breakfast with him. At the breakfast table an Independent minister addressed him to the following effect: "Mr. S., I heard of a very little man who had an immensely tall friend. This little man was very curious, and if a stir was going on, he would if possible be in the crowd; but he took this tall friend with him, who could see what was taking place, and of course duly informed his diminitive companion. Now you, Mr. S., are our tall friend, head and shoulders higher than the rest of us, and so able to see what we cannot. Will you therefore, be so good as to tell your little brethren how it is all done, how you get such crowds to hear you, while we have to preach to small congregations." Mr. Spurgeon replied with much good humour by quoting some well known rules relative to public speaking when his interlocutor rejoined, "Yes, all that we have been taught from our youth up, but it does not answer with us to produce these extraordinary results, and, therefore, we presume it does not explain your case." "Well," said Mr. S., "I would not preach to an inattentive congregation. If I saw I was not commanding their attention I would turn from the regular current of my discourse and begin to tell them some story. Perhaps saying, 'As I was going by the Black Bull the other day'—Now as soon as I named the Black Bull they would prick up their ears, one probably saying to himself, Aye, I know the Black Bull, I got a glass there the other day;—after thus rousing and keeping their attention for a little time I would return to my sermon, and I dare say they would not go to sleep again."

We give no opinion, commendatory or otherwise, of devices of this character. To escape the dulness of the pulpit we have no wish to see its dignity and solemnity sacrificed. Such a loss could not be counterbalanced by any amount of vivacity which might be gained.

> "He that negotiates between God and man,
> As God's ambassador, the grand concerns

Of judgment and of mercy, should beware
Of lightness in his speech. 'Tis pitiful
To court a grin, when you should woo a soul;
To break a jest, when pity should inspire
Pathetic exhortation; and address
The skittish fancy with facetious tales,
When sent with God's commission to the heart!
So did not Paul. . . . . .
. . . . . He would not stoop
To conquer those by jocular exploits,
Whom truth and soberness assailed in vain."

We thoroughly sympathize with these sentiments of Cowper. Still we think the style of preaching practised by many justly merits the satire and expostulation of Sydney Smith. "The English, generally remarkable for doing very good things in a very bad manner, seem to have reserved the maturity and plenitude of their awkwardness for the pulpit. Why this holoplexia on sacred occasions alone? Why call in the aid of paralysis to piety? Is it a rule of oratory to balance the style against the subject, and to handle the most sublime truths in the dullest language and the driest manner? Is sin to be taken from men as Eve was from Adam, by casting them into a deep slumber?"

Whatever may be thought of gaining attention by rhetorical artifice, this much is clear, to gain it the preacher must deal with the concrete rather than the abstract, and that his style should be pre-eminently illustrative. This was the method of our Lord. He taught the people in parables. His teaching was pictorial. "Unto what shall I liken the kingdom of heaven?" was a question He was continually asking for the sake of His hearers, and He made human analogies to illustrate heavenly truths and realities. Let all who preach His gospel go and do likewise, and they will not have to complain of want of appreciation on the part of the people.

Finally, popular preaching demands earnestness, and a somewhat dogmatic or positive manner. Clear, strong convictions, uttered with an air that bespeaks sincerity and confidence, are indispensable, with which let there be joined a tender sympathising spirit, and then the preacher will be qualified for being popular in the right sense of the word.

Popularity in the wrong, or secondary sense of the word, a true preacher will not care much about. Certainly, he will not worship it, nor think all is won when he gains it, nor all lost when he is without it. Above all, he will not have recourse to unworthy acts to secure such a prize.

It is really sad to know how little some preachers are in this respect, what a craving they have for notoriety and applause; how they will angle for compliments, and be soured when they can catch none. "He loved popularity," said Dr. Raffles of his gifted predecessor, Spencer, "but it was the popularity which followed him, not that which he must follow." A preacher from high motives will not be indifferent to the approval of his hearers. While he is to preach, whether they hear or forbear, he would rather they received his message than reject it. It is not an inappropriate prayer on behalf of any preacher that he may have favour in the sight of the people. Such a relation to his audience gives him power for good. To preach to prejudiced, estranged, or listless minds, is hard work, and as profitless as it is hard. Let the hearer then learn a lesson on this subject. In all congregations there are some who by their intelligence, or social position, take the lead in forming the sentiments of the congregation regarding the minister. Let them beware lest by adverse criticism they hinder his usefulness in this department of his work. If they cannot eulogize it does not follow that they are obliged to censure; nor is it a safe conclusion for any one to come to, that a preacher who does not meet the requirements of their taste, or their intelligence, has no call to his work, nor will accomplish any good in its prosecution.

ART. V.—FAITH AND FELLOWSHIP.

ISOLATION in the Christian life is altogether unsanctioned, we may say altogether unrecognised, in the teachings of the New Testament. Neither directly nor indirectly, by express assertion nor by implication, is it considered as possible. On the contrary the oneness of all believers in Christ is a truth presented on every page and in every variety of form. Now it is explicitly avowed, and anon it is necessarily implied. Though christians are many members, they are yet but one body. Their faith is "the common faith;" their salvation "the common salvation." They are "called in one body," so that their unity essentially inheres in their Christianity, and draws with it the consequence that they "have fellowship one with another." The very terms in which their relative character is designated is moulded by this truth. They are fellow-servants, fellow-soldiers, fellow-labourers, fellow-helpers, fellow-citizens, and fellow-heirs. Our faith then being regulated by New Testament teachings, we must believe in the communion of saints.

But these teachings are equally explicit on another point, namely, that Christian fellowship is the outgrowth of Christian faith. Faith is the basis on which the fellowship rests, or, to phrase it more correctly, the root from which it springs. Can any one misunderstand or gainsay the words of our Lord,—He that believeth shall be saved; that is, be admitted into communion with the people of God, by becoming one of them; and he that believeth not shall be damned; that is be excluded from the society or fellowship of that people? While His affirmation shows us that the saved secure their salvation by their faith, and the unsaved bring upon them their condemnation by their unbelief. Hence one distinctive name of a Christian is that of believer, and the Christian Church is called "the household of faith." It may be that he who enters this household is a man of feeble and imperfect faith, but it cannot be that he is a man whose predominant and voluntary state of mind, with regard to the verities of the Christian religion, is one of denial and doubt. All who share in the gospel fellowship have necessarily obtained, to some degree, like precious faith; and yet, let it be remembered, all may not have obtained it to the same degree, for "him that is weak in faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations."

Christian fellowship as a matter of fact, as an event of history, commenced on the day of Pentecost, and must evidently have had its birth in a common faith. "All that believed were together." "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul." "And believers were the more added to the Lord." And these believers it was who "continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers;" such fellowship being the natural outworking of their faith. No such fellowship could have been known among them but by means of the faith in which they participated as a common gift, and their faith unperverted in its exercise could not but lead to the practice of this fellowship.

This principle we hold to be most true and sacred, and lying at the very root of Christian communion. Yet a right principle may be wrongly or imperfectly held, and this we are now asserting, needs to be guarded against being misunderstood and misapplied, both as it regards its objects and exercise. Thus to guard it is the main purpose for which this paper is written.

The first error to be avoided in construing this principle is substituting faith in some human dogma, or in some particular formula of Christian doctrine, for faith in Christ himself. The faith that makes us Christians is the faith that should admit us to the privilege of church fellowship. This is the Apostolic canon, that we receive those whom God has received. In order to a faith that makes us truly Christians there are many things which must be believed about Christ, but they are to be believed in order to a personal reliance upon Him, and until that personal reliance is exercised all the preliminary faith to which we refer will not save us. Our abstract belief in a physician's ability to cure some malady under which we suffer will avail nothing to securing us the benefit of his skill until we place ourselves in the relation of patient to him. Our belief in his ability is only of service to us as it conducts to this result.

The same remark applies to Christ and salvation, though it is to be feared the many do not see it to be so. They have lost Christ, and faith in Him as a personal Saviour, in the numerous doctrines they teach about Christ, and the abstruse and metaphysical forms in which they present those doctrines for our acceptance. The truth which Peter on the day of Pentecost presented to the multitudes around him for their acceptance and belief, and by believing which they were brought into fellowship with the Apostles and with each other, was simply this—that God had made that same Jesus whom

they had crucified both Lord and Christ. This was the central truth of the teachings of all the Apostles, and they solemnly aver that other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ, or perhaps more accurately to express it, that Jesus is the Christ, the Illustrious Personage in whom all the prophecies concerning the Messiah are fulfilled. Hence Paul when he met the Jews in the synagogues reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, proving that Jesus was the Christ. Retention of the faith was, with him, "holding the Head;" apostacy from it, "denying the Lord who bought us;" while he devoutly invokes "grace upon all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

Here then, taking the Apostles of our Lord for our guide, we find the grand platform of Christian fellowship. The point of both spiritual and visible union amongst Christians is faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. Do you believe that Jesus is the Son of God, the Messiah, the Divine Saviour of men? Do you believe this? Not simply admit it, or allow it, or accredit it as you would an arithmetical or historical proposition in which you had no personal interest, but *believe* it, give to it the assent and consent of your understanding, your heart, your conscience? Do you so yield your whole intellectual and moral being to its influence, that you trust in Him solely for salvation and eternal life? If so, and you had lived in the times of the Apostles, they would have taken you by the hand and recognised you as their fellow in the Gospel.

How far this is the custom with modern churches in our land it is not necessary for us to state. Among us churches have mostly a rigidly doctrinal basis, and as a rule it is not all Christian truth, but some particular portion or some particular phase of it, they embody. Practically our National Church, as it assumes to be, admits to the fellowship of the Lord's Supper all who think well to come, but to do so is a violation of its constitution and consistency, inasmuch as it proclaims that a man cannot be saved, but without doubt shall perish everlastingly, unless he believes faithfully all the inexplicable mysteries of the so called Athanasian creed. While denominational churches have some Shibboleth of their own which we must learn to pronounce before we can be permitted to cross their threshold, or be cordially admitted to their membership. They act generally as if the Corinthian Church were the pattern Church of the New Testament, instead of having next to the Galatians the severest Apostolical censure resting upon it. Human distinctions are gloried in, and if it is not literally "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and

I of Cephas;" a spirit and practice prevail which are equivalent to this. Wesley, and Calvin, and Luther, and Knox, and other human names are raised to an equality with, if not in some instances to a supremacy over, the name of Christ. The result is that this Christendom of ours, which ought to have one faith, one hope, one Lord, and one baptism, is a very Babel ringing from end to end with the confusion and clamour of discordant tongues. To this unhappy state of things we cannot but ascribe the religious scepticism and indifference so sadly prevalent among us.

How can we help this? our reader may ask. Well, and suppose we cannot help it in the sense in which the question is put, what then? Are we to commend it? We may not be able to help, that is, to prevent the existence of deformity; for that reason are we to call it beauty? In many instances we cannot help the occurrence of evil and the perpetration of wrong; are we, therefore, to call evil good, and wrong right? No; it is far more healthy, though our vanity and self-esteem may be wounded thereby, to call things by their right names, and give everything that is wrong its merited condemnation. And, further, while we denounce the sins of the world, are we not inconsistent in sparing the sins of the Church? For there is a sense in which the schisms and discordancies among Christians may be helped. Tares do not spring up among the wheat spontaneously, nor would an enemy have the opportunity of sowing them if the true servants of Christ were ever faithful and vigilant. Let the Church consent to exalt Christ alone in her midst; let all her members and teachers and rulers cast down their pride, and restrain their ambition, and "submit to wholesome words, even the words of the Lord Jesus," and very soon we should see the unity of the Spirit to be maintained in the bonds of peace. Aye, but some one despondingly suggests, we cannot sway the action of churches! This is true, except perhaps in an indirect and very remote sense. Nevertheless we can control our own action and spirit, and for doing this we are responsible to our great Master. It is not for a Christian to lightly esteem church membership, or abstain from it, because he may think the terms of communion are not in full harmony with Apostolic teaching and practice. To admit such a principle of disintegration would be most disastrous both to our individual and collective Christian life. But in our intercourse with each other we may for ourselves follow after charity, we may be careful to eschew the spirit of schism and bigotry, and rather exemplify the all-embracing catholicity of feeling which invokes grace on all true lovers of the Lord Jesus.

We utter a deep conviction of our intellect and heart when we say, that the thing most needed is a revival amongst us of the spiritual fellowship of original Methodism. We wish to divest ourselves of all sectarian feeling, but in our judgment membership in Methodist churches or societies, as they used to be called, comes nearer to that "fellowship of faith" we now seek to explain than membership in any other church we know. There is no formulated creed to which the candidate is required to subscribe before being enrolled on the society's registry. As to doctrine, it is not asked whether you are Arminian or Calvinistic; though we admit on these points when they may come under consideration, you will hear definite teaching both from the pulpit and in the class meeting. And as to church government you are not asked whether you be Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Congregational. Nor are you met with a demand to declare whether you hold with believers' baptism or would administer the rite to infants. The great question is, are you desirous to be saved? Do you manifest this desire by ceasing to do evil and learning to do well? Are you looking to Christ as man's only Saviour? And is it your aim to be in spirit and life a true Christian, showing your faith in Christ by your obedience to all His known will? Then you have all the qualification demanded for Methodist fellowship, as that fellowship was originally practised, and to you a cordial reception will be afforded—

"Brethren in Christ, and well beloved,
To Jesus and His servants dear,
Enter, and show yourselves approved,
Enter, and find that God is here.

Welcome from earth: lo, the right hand
Of fellowship to you we give!
With open hearts and hands we stand,
And you in Jesus' name receive."

Charles Wesley's hymns on the Communion of Saints, and they are among the finest he has written, all breathe the same spirit. Their key note is to be found in two verses, which we quote—

"Other ground can no man lay,
JESUS TAKES OUR SINS AWAY!
Jesus the foundation is:
This shall stand, and only this."

And that with which the poem closes—

"Love, like death, hath all destroyed,
Rendered all distinctions void;
Names, and sects, and parties fall:
Thou, O Christ, art all in all!"

Church history shows us that the creed-making spirit has ever been the church's bane. As it has defined articles of faith one after the other, it has multiplied heresies and heretics, though in this way only it thought it could contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. When Mr. Wesley, led by the spirit and providence of God, entered on his course he took another and somewhat contrastive method. He preached Christian truth, not as an intellectual proposition, but as a quickening power; and when men felt and acknowledged its power he brought them into association with each other, not as a school of wranglers, nor to compare notes as to the way in which they apprehended abstract doctrines, but by the fellowship of sympathy and counsel to strengthen the spiritual life they had received.

"Let us join, 'tis God commands,
Let us join our hearts and hands;
Help to gain our calling's hope;
Build we each the other up:
God His blessing shall dispense;
God shall crown his ordinance;
Meet in His appointed ways,
Nourish us with social grace.

Hence may all our actions flow;
Love the proof that Christ we know;
Mutual love the token be,
Lord, that we belong to Thee:
Love, Thine image, love impart!
Stamp it on our face and heart!
Only Love to us be given!
Lord, we ask no other heaven."

The portraiture he drew of primitive Christianity, in his well-known poem bearing that name, is after the same pattern. The souls who first believed were

"Joined by the unction from above,
In mystic fellowship of love.

. . . . . .

They all were of one heart and soul,
And only love inspired the whole."

Was this representation of Christian communion a disparaging of the importance of Christian doctrine, and of correct apprehensions of it? Was communion practised after this manner an opening of the floodgates of error, whereby the Church was inundated with deadly heresies? Let historic fact answer these questions. Methodism has no written creed, exacts no verbal confession of faith from those she takes to her fellowship; after existing near two hundred years she numbers her adherents by millions; and yet this vast number spread over all parts of the earth have a oneness of faith, and, we will venture to add, a purity of faith which no creed-formed church, or denomination, ever realized.

The connection between faith and fellowship may be misunderstood and misapplied in relation to the association of our children with the church. It is thus misunderstood and misapplied when we infer from it that they have no participation in the fellowship of the Gospel until they come to years of maturity, and exercise a conscious faith for themselves. The reasoning frequently adopted on the relation of our children to church fellowship is something like this:—Under the Jewish dispensation the fellowship of saints was secured by natural descent. Those who could say they had Abraham for their father could claim membership with the Church. But under the Gospel natural birth goes for nothing in determining the spiritual character, they only are Christians who are born of the spirit, and only true Christians should partake of Church-membership. You must, therefore, wait till men attain the age when they are capable of faith, and see whether they exercise it, before you can determine that they shall have any part in the fellowship of the Gospel.

There is to our apprehension theoretical and practical error in abundance in this reasoning. If natural descent was something in the church-standing of the Jews it was not everything. Unless there were added to it faith and obedience, when years came for that faith and obedience, all the advantages flowing from Israelitish parentage went for nothing. The unbelieving and disobedient Jew would be cut off from the congregation, though he could claim to be a descendant of Abraham. His condition, therefore, will scarcely sustain the inference deduced from it.

Under the Gospel dispensation children are beloved for the father's sake. The children of believing parents are not to be treated as heathen children; by their parentage they are to be regarded as holy to the Lord, according to the teaching of the Apostle Paul, the faith of one of the parents secures this

privileges to them. "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy."

And then while the fellowship of the Gospel is the fruit of faith, it is also, in a sense, the source of faith to our little ones." "Mother church" is a phrase, as applied to the Establishment of our country, often ridiculed; but as applied to the real Church of Christ it is expressive of a vitally important truth. The Church is intended to be the channel of life to us, and it is not for us to sever our children from its fellowship, to tell them to stand off and be aliens and strangers until intelligent and conscious faith is exercised. Rather, according to apostolic teaching, we have to bring them up in the admonition of the Lord; or, according to the command of Christ, to suffer the little children to come unto Him, and forbid them not; and we are not to deprive them the privilege of being in the household of faith until they give evidence that they are unworthy of it. In two of the Epistles of the New Testament children are recognised as of the fellowship, and recognised in such a way as to warrant the inference that the children of believing parents are in the Church until they wilfully go out of it, and not, as many of the present day seem to think, out of it till they voluntarily come in. Indeed if it be not so, we can see no meaning or propriety in the rite of infant baptism. On the contrary, if our children have no share in "the fellowship in the Gospel" until they attain to a conscious faith, we can well understand how our Baptist brethren are right in holding child baptism to be a delusion and a snare.

Our Lord's admonition not to despise or offend, that is make to stumble, the little ones who believe in Him does not, we fear, receive from His Church all the consideration it ought to have. Notwithstanding our Sunday schools, and our increased attention to the education of children at the present day, as Christians we despise or neglect them in many of our Church regulations, and by this means offend or injure them in their Christian life. By these regulations we express doubt where we ought to give confidence, and repel where we should be intensely anxious to attract, and the results have been in many instances most sad and mischievous. "If we may hope to witness the descent and perpetuity of holy families," writes Dr. R. W. Hamilton, in his Life of Ely," "the practice of early communion and profession must be revived. Meditating the nature and purport of the domestic constitution it seems wrong to part with a child to the world who has not first been given

to the Church." In this sentiment we fully concur, and can also endorse the experience of the writer when he says he has known among some churches, in youthful conversion, a kind of new dispensation. It has leavened the whole lump. All have been quickened and spiritualized. But what about the constancy of these Christian children. Did the young candidates endure? asks the Dr.; and he answers it by saying that a large and carefully-sifted experience showed that the failures and defections were fewer than upon any other average period of human life. A similar testimony has been given to the comparative constancy of youthful Christians by one who, by his pen, has been pre-eminently a teacher of babes, and a feeder of Christ's lambs. Mr. Todd says, "I have more than once had the pleasure of welcoming to the table of Jesus Christ those who were under twelve years of age; they were like the early stars of evening, very small, put pure and bright and beautiful; they held on their way, too, gloriously. I have not half the fears that a converted child will dishonour religion, that I have that the aged sinner, who has lived in the iron habits of sin for half a century will do it: with him it is the work of life and death to break off these old habits; his thoughts wicked and vile, will ever and anon flow back into the deep worn channels; but piety in the child gushes up like the breaking out of a new spring making its own new channel, growing, and widening, and beautifying as it flows"

While, then, the duty of parents calls them to caution, and the purity of Christian communities demands serious investigation, yet, we believe, more injury has been done by a repulsive inquest than by a spontaneous welcome, by holding back than by leading onwards, the children of believers to Church fellowship

NOTICE OF BOOK.

The Life of Jesus, the Christ. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1871.

As a preacher the author of this work has attained to a wider celebrity than ever fell to the lot of any one man. In this respect he has no compeer in the pulpit except it may be Charles Henry Spurgeon. These two, though wholly diverse in their talents and character, as preachers divide the world between them.

Great preachers are rarely great authors. The talents which qualify a man to make a good sermon do not necessarily qualify him to write a good book. And then the effectiveness of a sermon often arises from causes external to the sermon itself; the preacher's manner, his elocution, or earnestness of spirit, making it tell on the audience. A reader is moved more by what a book contains than by the mode of its presentation, though expression and style are great contributories to effect.

Those who admire Mr. Beecher in the pulpit, or, rather, those who admire his productions in the pulpit presented to them through the press, and they are to be numbered by hundreds of thousands, are doomed to no disappointment in the pages of his Life of Jesus. It is an incomparable book, and when completed will be invaluable alike to the student and the devotional reader.

The writer says he has been moved to his work in the hope of inspiring a deeper interest in the noble Personage whose history is given in the Gospels, and he has endeavoured to accomplish his object by presenting scenes that occurred two thousand years ago as they would appear to modern eyes if the events had taken place in our day. His assumed task it will be seen at once is a difficult one, though highly interesting and important. The execution, however, is worthy of the conception.

The Lives of Christ recently given to the world have been mainly of a controversial character, and have naturally partaken largely of the dialectic and critical spirit. Such lives, Mr. Beecher says, are necessary, for as long as great learning and accute criticism are brought to assail the text of the Gospels, their historic authenticity, the truth of their contents, and the ethical nature of their teachings, so long must great learning and sound philosophy be brought to the

defence of those precious documents. But these Lives of Christ are not the best for general reading. While they may lead scholars from doubt to certainty, they are likely to lead plain people from certainty to doubt, and to leave them there. He has, therefore, studiously avoided a polemic spirit, seeking to produce conviction without controversy.

The reader then must not go to this work for discussions on the history of the text of the Gospels, the authenticity of the several narratives, or the many philosophical questions arising in such a field, nor for answers to the thousands of objections which swarm around the narrative in the books of the sceptical school of criticism. These the author tells us he has attentively considered in his own mind, but in his book there is not a formal recognition of them, his endeavour having been as far as possible so to state the facts as to take away the grounds from which the objections were aimed. The whole work bears evidence of the truthfulness of the author's statement, that it has been written in full sympathy with the Gospels as authentic historical documents, and with the nature and teachings of the great Personage whom they describe, and that it is the Jesus of the four Evangelists, and not a modern substitute, whom he has sought to depict, in His life, His social relations, His disposition, His deeds and doctrines.

The only point, perhaps, on which theologians will be disposed to quarrel with Mr. Beecher will be found in the position he takes in the chapter entitled, "The Doctrinal Basis." Lives of Christ have been written from the purely humanitarian view; another class have represented Him as more than human, but as less than divine. "A third view is held, which may be called the doctrine of the Church, at least since the fourth century. It attributes to Jesus a double nature—a human soul and a divine soul in one body." He discards the theories of the schools, and clings to the simple and intelligible representations of the Word. "*God was manifest in the flesh.*" "The identification of the divine and the human nature," he says, "was one of the grand results of the Incarnation. The beauty and preciousness of Christ's *earthly* life consists in its being a true *divine* life, a presentation to us, in forms that we can comprehend, of the very thoughts, feelings, and actions of God when placed in our condition in this mortal life. To insert two natures is to dissolve the charm." Still while he alleges that the doctrine of a double nature did not take its shape from Scripture statements, but from the exigencies of controversy, he also admits that it was thrown up to meet the assaults upon the true divinity of Christ; and, although

cumbrous and involved, it saved Christianity. For the truth of the proper divinity of Christ is the marrow of the sacred Scriptures. It is the only point at which natural and revealed religion can be reconciled. This, then, is Mr. Beecher's stand-point, and we refer our readers to his production, in the confidence that a perusal of it will make their hearts glow with a warmer affection to Him on whom all our hopes for salvation hang.

Notices of books received shall appear in the next number.

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY.

DECEMBER, 1872.

ART. I.—HIERARCHISM; OR THE RELIGION OF THE PRIEST.

"WHENEVER religion is under discussion," says the celebrated author of the History of the Reformation, "there are three points to which our attention is directed—God, man, and the priest. There can only be three kinds of religion on the earth according as God, man, or the priest, is its author, or its head. Heirarchism, or the religion of the priest; Christianity, or the religion of God; Rationalism, or the religion of man, are the three doctrines which divide Christendom in our days."

We propose in this paper giving a brief exposition of the religion of the priest. We do so under the conviction that a great deal of the religion of the present day is running into priestism. This is confessedly the case in our so-called National Church. Some deplore this, others rejoice over it, but none can deny the fact. Indisputably the ritualistic movement in that Church is in this direction; and by the recent judgment in the Bennett case that movement has been fortified in a remarkable manner. It has now a legal standing in the Church as far as the essential doctrine on which it is based is concerned. That is, a clergyman of the Church of England—the bulwark of Protestantism as it has so often been boastingly called—can hold, and teach, and practically apply, the doctrine of the real presence in the Sacrament, and no one can assail his position, nor any ecclesiastical authority visit him with censure for his conduct.

This admitted, perhaps some one may ask, what concern it is of ours seeing we do not belong to the Church; by our own choice having relinquished its ministry and communion? To which we reply that our nonconformity does not destroy our political relation to the Established Church, nor should it abate our christian interest in its character and acts, or the character and acts of its ministers. Besides the teachings and acts of these ministers are not confined to their respective congrega-

tions. A system of propagandism is in more active and extensive use than perhaps many are aware of. Thousands of tracts and small books are being circulated through the country explaining and enforcing their priestly notions and practices.

But we mean to speak of the religion of the priest as embodied in the Romish Hierarchy. We do so because it is admitted on all hands that this religion is perfected in the Papal system, and will invariably bring its votaries to its adoption. The high church party, as it is designated, in the Establishment is as sure to become openly Romanist as it exists. That this is the goal of their wishes and efforts is candidly admitted, or rather ostentatiously proclaimed, by their literary organs and champions. By the Romanists themselves, also, special attempts are now being made to commend this system to our approval and to our embrace. The conversion of England to the Catholic faith is what the hearts of their dignitaries are set upon, and to accomplish this object no effort within their power will be left unused. In this is shown their wisdom equally with their zeal. The fulfilment or nonfulfilment of this event decides the future of the Romish Church. They have understanding of the times sufficient to see this, and a zeal for their religion which leads them to act accordingly. With such leaders as Archbishop Manning and Monsignor Capel the Papal hosts may go forth to battle in the confidence that neither skill nor courage will be wanting on their part in order to victory.

The best preservative against being caught in the meshes of their specious logic is to have a clear and truthful conception of the system they so zealously and eloquently advocate, for we shall find it to be subversive of all christian truth and christian freedom.

And first let us get a right idea of the Romish Priesthood in itself—in its internal constitution, or the relation the several members of the body have to each other, and also to the body in its entirety. Until we understand this we do not know truly what Popery is. The Romish priesthood is a Pontifical hierarchy, its members therefore are not on an equality with each other, they consist of subordinates and superiors, and you see rank rising above rank in authority until you come to the supreme dignitary—the head which governs and cements the whole body. "There is probably no institution in the world in which the system of absolute rule on the one hand, and implicit obedience on the other, is carried to so great a height as in that of the Romish hierarchy. The inferior clergy are completely subject to the superiors who are placed over

them, these again to *their* superiors; and all, including the highest dignitaries, to the Pope, who claims to be the "successor of Peter" in the bishopric of Rome, and sole vicar and representative of the Lord Jesus Christ upon earth."*

But though there be many members in the Romish hierarchy, and these members partake of varying dignity and power, still they constitute but one body, and all its parts participate in the fulness of the whole. Between the priesthood and the people, or laity, however, an impassable gulf is placed as to the possession of spiritual authority—no intermingling or blending between the two is admitted of—on the part of the priest it is absolute rule, on the part of the people it is implicit obedience.

The authority of the Romish priesthood in relation to the laity has a peculiar character, indeed it is perfectly unique in its kind. It is not an authority resting on the superior intelligence and sanctity of the parties who claim to exercise it, nor does it govern itself on the voluntary suffrages of those over whom it is swayed. Paucity of intellect and unholiness of life may characterize the priesthood, but neither ignorance nor sin denudes its members of this authority. Or those over whom it is swayed may indignantly resist the domination, but that leads to no relinquishment of it. Where practically the power is null and void in its operation, its existence is theoretically maintained with the utmost pertinacity. Though in a state of torpor it lives, and it lives to clothe itself with energy and display its potency as occasion may serve,

The authority is not personal but official, and the office to which it is attached is not that of a teacher—an intellectual and moral guide; but it is that of a priest—a mediator—one who negotiates in the highest matters between God and man. And while this authority has its root in the sacerdotal character of the Romish hierarchy, the soil in which this root is planted, and from which it derives its vitality and vigour, is the peculiar doctrine held by that Church on the Christian Sacraments. According to its dogma these Sacraments are not simply commemorative institutions; ordinances designed to give visibility to the church—to be an outward bond of union among the followers of Christ, and keep in perpetual remembrance the great facts and truths which they symbolize; but "they are outward and visible signs of an inward grace supposed to be annexed to them and properly inherent in them." The Sacraments, therefore, are the sole originators and sustainers of our spiritual life. Salvation does not flow from the Word, it is not by belief

* Gurney's Puseyism traced to its root, p. 31.

in the truth that we are quickened from a death in trespasses and sins to a new and holy life; nor is it through godly sorrow for sin, and a cordial reliance upon the death of Christ as an atonement for sin, that we obtain pardon; these blessings come through the mysteries, that is the Sacraments, of the Church, for they alone are the channels of divine influence—the instruments of grace and salvation.

The material elements of the chief Sacrament undergo by the priest's blessing and consecration a supernatural transformation. He changes the bread and the wine into the real body and blood of Jesus Christ. That is the purport of the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation; the word means "conversion of substance," and the Romanist uses it to designate the dogma of his Church which teaches that when the words of consecration are pronounced by the priest the whole substance of the bread is changed into the very body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, and the whole substance of the wine is changed into the blood of Christ, while only the visible appearance of the bread and wine remains; and that together with his real flesh and blood, the entire person of the God-man, humanity and divinity, is really physically present.*

From this doctrine it follows that the Lord's table becomes an altar, and the commemoration of the holy communion is a sacrifice, and the ministry in celebrating it offers God under the appearance of bread and wine an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ. And this exhibition is not simply an act of worship, or of thanksgiving, it is an act which atones for sin and propitiates God, and that not only on the behalf of the living but also of the dead.

But while the Romish priesthood ascribe this efficacy to the Sacraments, the members of that body claim to be the only rightful dispensers of them. By their hands alone they are properly and efficaciously administered. The logical basis of this assumption is the doctrine of the apostolical succession held by Rome. Christ communicated to the apostles, and they to the bishops, the unction of the Holy Spirit; and this Spirit is to be procured only in that order of succession. Episcopal ordination, therefore, is absolutely necessary to a valid and effective exercise of the Christian ministry, and he who without this qualification assumes the office and administers the Sacraments seals his own damnation, he sins after the similitude of Korah and Dathan and Abiram's transgression, and touches the ark of God with unhallowed hands. Thus does

* Hodges Outlines of Theology, p. 513.

the Romish priesthood claim to be the sole depositary of divine grace, she monopolizes the precious gifts which God has bestowed upon us in the gospel, and deals them out to a perishing world on her own terms.

Well, then, might she at the Council of Trent contend so earnestly against the Protestant doctrine of a free justification. Let this blessing come of faith on the part of the recipient and Rome's power is gone, as is the power of any human priesthood. She knew this and acted accordingly, and the result was that justification by works and as a progressive act was established as the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

On this fact well does Ranke in his History of the Popes remark :—" The most important difficulty was thus overcome, since justification is progressive in the heart of man, and undergoes continued development, the Sacraments are manifestly indispensible; for by these it is begun, or if begun is continued, or when lost is recovered. The whole seven might then be retained without difficulty as heretofore, and their origin be referred to the author of faith, since the institutions of Christ's Church were communicated not by Scripture only but also by tradition. Now these Sacraments embrace the whole life of man as we know well; in every stage of its progress they represent the true power of the hierarchy; by these does she rule every day and every hour of the layman's existence, since they are not the types of grace only, they impart grace, completing thus the mystical relation in which man is believed to stand with God.*"

Now this authority of the priest either as a doctrine or a fact is not indigenous to the Christian religion. The Christian Church in its primitive state, as it came from the hands of its divine author, and as it was taught and governed by the Apostles, knew nothing of such an order of men as compose the Romish hierarchy, much less of the authority they claim. " Jesus Christ," it has been justly said, " established a ministry but He founded no priesthood, He abolished the laws of Moses with its sacrifices and priests, and dethroned the living idols of the world, the priests of paganism. He took away from man what man had taken from God, and re-established the soul in immediate connexion with the divine fountain of truth by proclaiming Himself sole Master and sole Mediator. 'One is your Master even Christ, and all ye are brethren.' "

The Epistles are in perfect harmony with the Gospels on this subject; what Christ taught them the Apostles transmitted unadulterated to those who believed on Christ through their

* Vol. I, p. 156, Bohn's Edition.

word. There is not a single instance on record in which they assumed or exercised priestly functions, nor can a single passage be found in their writings which breathes a sacerdotal spirit. A hierarchy in the Christian Church is especially disavowed and condemned by Peter of whom the Pope claims to be the legitimate successor, and a priestly order utterly discarded. The apostolic doctrine is that all who are brought to a living union with Christ are priests to God, inasmuch as through the sacrifice which Christ has offered once for all they have free and full access to the presence of God. Having tasted that the Lord is gracious, believers as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. And as explanatory of these words we may connect with them a subsequent verse :—" Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light."

But this sound doctrine was not maintained by Christ's followers in its integrity. Some were faithful in retaining it even to death, but there came a falling away, an apostacy from the true faith, which embraced in its wide sweep ultimately the majority of professing christians. This apostacy undoubtedly had its origin in the depravity of the human heart, aided also by Satanic agency. Its rise was gradual and almost imperceptible, but when once the mystery of iniquity began to work it met with congenial and sustaining elements in the beliefs and religious practices held and observed by the members of the church previous to their embracing Christianity. It was not in the nature of things that the Christian religion should escape corruption from the creeds established before its announcement, for these had entwined themselves with the habits and wants of daily life, and were bound up with all the old memories of the world.

Both Jews and Pagans had been familiar with sacrifices and priests, and would not at once cast off their predilection for them, but would be glad to find something analagous to them under the Christian system. Nor were there wanting mistaken and designing men to cast the seed of error and superstition into so favourable a soil—men who wished to lord it over God's heritage, and place themselves as gods in the temple of God. Nor did they labour in vain; gradually but surely did sacerdotal doctrines take effect on the minds of men until the language of the prophet was literally realized in Christendom. " A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the

land; the prophets prophesy falsely and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so." Jer. V., 30, 31.

And history shows us that when the sacerdotal element is allowed to have its full development the rule which the priests bear is most complete and absolute. It extends to our whole person and condition, and admits of no questioning and no appeal. The intellect, the heart, the conscience, are all under their sway. They must know your acts, your words, your thoughts. To them your inmost soul must be naked and opened. The priest is your confessor, and you must so confess to him that he knows you as you are known of yourselves. And then he it is that decides your destiny. You are in his hands, and should he impose the severest penance you dare not disobey, for you depend on his dictum for your salvation. With him is the divine prerogative of absolution, and your disobedience may be death to the soul. In his favour you may be said to find your life; for when you come to the close of your earthly pilgrimage there is no safety for your departing spirit unless he is there to perform his mysterious rites, to place the sacramental wafer on your tongue, and administer extreme unction; and after your departure he alone can by the sacrifice of the mass for the dead deliver you from the pains of purgatory and introduce you into the joys and glories of heaven.

This sad apostacy from the Christian faith was foreseen and foretold by the Apostle Paul. The well-known passage in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians we take as a prediction of the rise and consummation of the Romish Hierarchy, and our wonder is that they who run cannot read it to be so. But their is such a thing as judicial blindness. God sending men strong delusions that they should believe a lie. To one of the two parties—Protestant or Papal—which divide Christendom this blindness has happened; but to which, we say to our readers,—judge ye. For ourselves we cannot help saying we are astonished with an astonishment at many of the utterances of the chief champions of the Papacy, such, for instance, as those lately given by the dignitaries named at the commencement of this article. Their assumptions are so arrogant and baseless, their reading of history so untrue, their perversion of facts so palpable, that it almost surpasses belief that men of intelligence and of high ecclesiastical position would have the effrontery to commit themselves to many of the statements they have made. If incontrovertible facts are to decide the question, in our judgment the perilous times of the last days

have had their fulfilment in the teachings and doings of popery. With the adherents of that system has been the departure from the faith, and the giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, so solemnly foretold by the Apostle. They have been the people to turn their ears away from the truth, and be turned unto fables.

But we live in times when the admonition is not unnecessary,—Let those who think they stand, take heed lest they fall. Having received the truth as in Jesus, the truth which makes us free from all human priests, it becomes us to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, that we be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. St. Paul's charge to Timothy may be appropriately addressed to every Protestant; "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; that from a child thou has known THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, WHICH ARE ABLE TO MAKE THEE WISE UNTO SALVATION THROUGH FAITH WHICH IS IN CHRIST JESUS. For all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works."

Where God's word is accepted and adhered to in its integrity priestism cannot live He then that hath ears to hear let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches.

ART. II.—SHORT ESSAYS.

BY H.

I.

CHRISTIANS generally in these days have not that strong hold of God which is essential to pre-eminent piety, and which many of our illustrious and non-illustrious forefathers had. Some of them stars undoubtedly; others mere nebulæ; but all of them, in this matter of faith-grasp, veritable suns. That faith-grasp of theirs is going, if not gone, out of fashion; we cannot well say why just now, except the worshipping of gold-bags, of politics, of science and its Protean marvels, has something to do with it; anyway, the spiritual aspect of things as opposed to the material is not very popular just now. Without question, compared with our grasp of other things, our grasp of God is weak, spiritless, feeble—we may say no grasp at all. The Christian, in thousands of cases (so we think), conducts himself as if he and God were perfect strangers. God is put farther and farther away, till the Christian's thought, affection, and desire, instead of soaring as the lark to "heaven's gate," descend gradually to the temporal, the material, the human, and are satisfied to stay there. God at once becomes too great, and too conscious of His greatness to allow of friendship—too holy to desire our company—too high above us ever to be on a level with us. How comes this notion to be so general? Is it not owing to a prevalent impression that it is a sign of intellectual inferiority to accept anything which cannot be proved by reason or demonstrated by experiment? that things which cannot be seen and handled, though perhaps they cannot be denied, yet cannot be proved? Once insinuate a doubt into a Christian's mind as to spiritual verities—once let him feel uncertain about them—and from that moment God becomes a stranger, residing somewhere in the infinite solitudes of eternity, but certainly not in his heart. In consequence he feels self-accused when he enters the Divine presence. He expects a look of reproach, a glance of reproof from God, so to speak,—a significant intimation of superiority tantamount to a refusal of the familiarity of friendship. God is judged in this matter as if he were man;—the greatest proof of a decaying spiritual life one can find, that terrible misjudgment. The eye of faith must be blind to allow of it. And what can follow but an accumulation of simulations till one's religious

life becomes a vast dissimulation—a hollow thing, dead as death? In this age of appearances, of unsubstantialities, the appearance of Divine friendship is often taken for the beating of its heart, with the inevitable result of the cultivation of appearances—utmost radical hypocrisy.

I am not arguing for unhallowed, irreverent boldness in approaching Deity. He has the strongest hold of God who approaches Him with all reverence and humility, yet (I must add) with all the confidence and trust of truest friendship,—with all the consciousness of a creature's finitude, yet with all the assurance of a Divine sonship. The aim of the Gospel is to bring God and man as near to each other as possible. If it fails here, it succeeds nowhere. Grant this to it, and it is at once raised far above Buddhism, Brahminism, Mahometanism, and Mysticism. *These* are but human efforts to reach the Divine; *that* is a Divine effort to reach the human. With man the task was impossible, but with God all things are possible. He, therefore, who makes his nature the dwelling-place of Deity realizes most perfectly the Christian ideal—"Abide in me and I in you."

To take God to our heart is the true way to exalt God to our thought; for true thought is right feeling embalmed. They who have exalted God to their thought (as they supposed) by putting Him away from their heart have simply magnified His power at the expense of His love, and turned Him who is "love" into a mere conception of the "infinite" as cold to the heart as abstract to the thought. But such an unfelt, unknown God is no-God. Only He who is known by us in and through the heights and depths of every experience of body, soul, and spirit, can be God to us in any worthy, practical sense. We owe our conviction of this—an offspring of faith—to Christianity. But how lamentably weak is such conviction just now!

II.

It seems to me that *thinking*, of itself, is no great strain upon the vital forces, no great cause of uneasiness and pain. The strain, the pain, the uneasiness, come from other things, not belonging to it in itself, but often—invariably—connected with it, when spoken or written. Such as (1) the controversies to which it frequently gives rise; (2) the conflicts of opposing schools of thought; (3) the alienation of friends; (4) the failure of many, high in one's regard, to enter into and thoroughly understand it, through lack of intellectual sympathy:—four harassing things. The mere mention of contro-

versy suggests uncharitableness, sophistry, fallacy, prejudice, bigotry, tradition,—even a host of uncomfortable things, sufficient to prevent the sleep of the soundest sleeper and make the strongest nerved thinker nervous. What delicate cruelties, what ingenious methods of torture are in the power of a skilful and unscrupulous controversialist!—amounting to a mighty outrageous Inquisition, with every abominable appliance! Relentless irony, cutting sarcasm, rasping ridicule, merciless wit, crushing logic—these are the weapons, the thought-racks, of controversial Inquisitors: sufficient surely to make a man mad! When, in addition to this, as often happens, a whole school of thought is roused into indignant protests, coarse or refined bullyings, secret envyings, with all manner of jealousies as to vested interests, and so forth; when all the off-scourings of human nature are pressed into war service against one; when the din grows till all quiet thinking and all peace of mind are impossible, how then? He must be a great man who could keep calm, patient, unmoved—eat, sleep, and digest as usual—in the midst of it all: indeed, would he be a man? and not rather a machine for thinking? Everyway an improvement, I should think, if one could only construct a machine for thinking: steel nerves, at any rate, would be proof against every poisoned dart. And what an infinite source of pain it is to find that your path of thought is leading you away, far away from your best friends. They cannot follow you; you know it; you feel it daily more and more strongly, and the pain of it sinks deeper and deeper into your soul till it becomes agony. O the penalties of thinking!—inevitable penalties! But these are not all, by any means. There is the disappointment, the misery of knowing that few, perhaps none, estimate rightly one's expressed thought. Many look at it from a wrong stand-point; fail, therefore, to see the true meaning, or draw from it a meaning hitherto unimagined; and pompously conclude the whole performance is a failure. Their education, habits of thought, prejudices, and surroundings prevent due sympathy—that kind and degree of it which are essential to a just judgment of expressed thought. This gives rise to misjudgments, misunderstandings, misrepresentations, and all kinds of annoyances. Altogether the strain upon the vital forces arising from these and like things is no slight one, and often has been more than human nature could bear—as in poor Keats' case. Blessed is the man who is understood!

We called these, just now, *inevitable* penalties—inevitable, alas! in the present state of things, but unnecessary in the nature of things. The speedy writing, the hurried thinking

which have become almost a necessity in these days of newspapers, reviews, and books, while apparently perpetuating the disease we complain of, suggest to us its cure. Men will begin to see, as they begin to think for themselves, that to interfere in any way with the expression of thought, either in speech or in writing, is foolish, unprofitable work, and that sympathy, charity, tolerance, justice are the best possible critics.

III.

THE trials, crosses, sorrows, afflictions, bereavements of life we learn to bear patiently, because we have a dim faith that in another world the reason why we had to pass through and bear them will be told us. When we now ask, Why have we to pass through such things? we cannot answer; faith comes to our aid by pointing to heaven and telling us to *wait.*

I sometimes think that the mystery of all this will be solved, not so much by reasons supplied by God for the explanation of our individual troubles, as by a special gift or acquisition of spiritual insight—the insight of our spiritualized natures into all the conditions, the dangers and the safeguards, the fear and the glory of moral and spiritual life. I think of God as so far revealing to us the mysteries of moral being as that we shall not only say "He hath done all things well," but even rejoice that we were permitted to share in the darker responsibilities of moral existence, perhaps knowing that the one could not have been without the other. So is the daughter taken into the confidence of the mother and the son into the confidence of the father in due season. The increased knowledge, the assumption of new responsibilities of life convince both that many uncomfortable experiences in the past, occasioned as they thought by the action of their parents, were not the results of parental action at all, but *results of life,* over which, it may be, the parents mourned at the time as much as their children. Our own higher spiritual life, embracing fuller knowledge and keener insight into things, will, I imagine, supply us with the reasons why we had certain troubles. They may not be formulated, not even mentioned. They will be contained in and come out of our higher spiritual life itself, and perhaps take the form of a feeling—an instinct that will be more satisfactory than any number of reasons. In consequence, we shall be satisfied that the troubles of earthly life were right for us; but not only this: we shall rejoice that we were permitted to participate in the dark as well as in the bright side of moral life—that, while we see such hard experiences as we complain of could not have been

avoided in moral government, we have no disposition at all to shirk our full measure of responsibility, no desire to part with our share of the consequences of moral being.

This state of feeling and of thought is much more than the resignation and faith which says "Thy will be done." It is the soul, in its coming-of-age, and after comprehending in consequence some of the deeper mysteries of moral being, voluntarily accepting its share of moral responsibility, and at once seeing that to have gone through every vicissitude of moral life was a moral necessity, governmentally just, and every way beneficial for us. The one state is the child leaning on its father, and asking why it cannot walk; the other state is the child grown into a man, and walking for himself. Most Christians attain but in part to this latter state; in its completeness it is one of our future experiences. Some saintly spirits, a few exceptionally pious men and women, have experienced not a little of what we mean. Jesus undoubtedly experienced it; there is evidence of that, I think, in His unmurmuring acceptance of His lot—His uncomplaining spirit. There always seems to me to have been in Him an unfathomable sadness and an attractive strength, both born of clearest spiritual insight and of a voluntary acceptance of all spiritual responsibilities. While He endured He knew why He must endure, and His endurance of all things was surely in harmony with righteousness and love.

Then we must remember that all our troubles are but temporary; in heaven our vision of trouble will be retrospective, not prospective. When we know all, experience of trouble will be impossible.

Nor should we forget the beneficent uses of trouble.

IV.

I HAVE frequently observed that men's characters are most clearly revealed in their conduct towards children; sometimes in the case of their own children; but most frequently in the case of other children. In the latter case the powerful parental affection does not interfere with the free full display of character, as in the former case. At the same time, the parental affection is an important and a beautiful trait of character, and to be taken account of in judging of it. If a certain man, who the greater part of his time is dull, morose, snappish, and unamiable, in the presence of children is gentle, loving, careful lest a look or word or action should jar upon their finer susceptibilities, I should conclude that the man really was at heart what he was to the children. I should

overlook his moroseness and snappishness, as these would not, in my opinion, supply the key to his character.

Why cannot men be always as amiable, as interesting, as they are sometimes? Well, in judging of character, we must look *behind* as well as *at* what we see. What we see is the result of experiences rooted, it may be, in the years of youth and the days of childhood. Men have worked up to what they are, and the significant movements of such a sacred thing as *life*, from its first pulse-beat, must all be taken into account, for so is experience constituted and character formed. There is no free and easy method of reading character, of understanding men. The methods adopted by physiognomy and phrenology, though generally excellent, fail to account for an immense number of character-phenomena. Life is too prolific, manifests itself too variously, for the stereotyped rules of scientific character-judges. Human character will fit into no mould, for not only is every man different to his fellow, but the same man developes different complexions of character at different periods of life. The failure of youthful ambitions, the disappointments common and uncommon to all, discoveries of the hollowness, the deceitfulness of men, circumstances unfavourable to the growth of a good character—these, and a thousand other unnameable things, acting and re-acting upon an eager, a hopeful, a susceptible, and a noble mind, must leave behind some traces in the character in after life not altogether fair to look upon. The kernel of a good heart is often surrounded with prickly thorns. To look upon children is to look upon those who are unspoilt, and who may make the voyage of life without soul-wreck and without going far out of the track. Hence they who have strayed, or been wrecked, are drawn to them. The heart generously hopes well for others when it cares not to hope well for itself. How often a child's smile, or a flower, or a song, will make an old man young again!—will wake into sweet music childhood's life-echoes, slumbering in his almost worn-out heart! Certain conjunctions of circumstances, specially favourable to the development of the better side of human nature, often startle us by their power of calling forth the noblest feelings, thoughts, looks, words. But the great reason why we cannot always be what we are sometimes is that the past will not be ignored: it is in us, and we carry it with us. To human character there is a past as well as a present, and the key to the present is to be found in the past—not far from the home-life of the youth.

There is a scale in human character. The lowest point of it represents the greatest variation in the manifestation of true

and beautiful character, the highest point the least variation. It is sometimes said, "As we cannot always have circumstances to our mind, we must bring our mind to circumstances." The saying is good only a certain distance; for it is often best to keep the mind away altogether from the things we cannot have to our mind. If the mountain will not come to Mahomet, Mahomet can, if he chooses, stay where he is as well as go to the mountain. Circumstances are binding only to two classes of men: to the wise who *allow* themselves to be bound, and to the weak who *cannot help* being bound. In proportion as a man is "master of his fate," acknowledges and asserts his supremacy over circumstances, does he rise in the scale of character; for this supremacy demands self-discipline, self-culture, a powerful motive and a good one, and continuous diligence. The time is coming when all that is noblest and best in us shall, doubtless, be supreme without variation.

Man, in the meanwhile, has immense power over man in helping to make that constant which, alas! is so variable—viz., the best side of our character. He or she who intuitively, instinctively sees the true metal in us through all the rough ore which surrounds it has the greatest power over us. That insight is the secret of man's power over man for good. By a responsive intuition or instinct we know when we are rightly estimated, and the feelings which result from this are amongst the most powerful instruments of the highest education.

V.

"MINISTERS of the Gospel do not sufficiently deal with practical, every-day experiences in their pulpit addresses: they give expositions of doctrine and of ethical truth which are admirable and impressive as a rule; but they do not apply what they say to the ordinary avocations of life:" so I have heard it said. And I thought there was some amount of truth in the objection. Too frequently the doctrines on which a sect lays greatest stress receive the largest share of attention, to the prejudice of those broad, all-embracing, all-applicable truths which are the daily support of all religious men, and in connection with which and for which they are found suffering, fearing, fighting every hour of the day. In connection with this for the most part admirable preaching, certain theological phrases are freely used—phrases which, in the case of many who hear them, mean anything or nothing, and certainly convey no savory spiritual food to the hungry souls of the congregation. A mode of address in harmony with the natural language of the heart; a preacher who is in sympathy with the varied,

every-day struggles, hopes and fears of his flock, and who manifests that sympathy in his sermons; an audience which, by the leverage of heart-speech in connection with heart-hearing, is raised to a higher plane of spiritual life without losing its interest in the sacred (ordinarily called *ordinary)* paths of life;—these are still desiderata. While admitting so much, a few things must not be forgotten:

1. Each person who is perplexed in applying religious principles to daily life, or who needs advice in any religious matter, may go to his minister, who will gladly help him as far as he can. I say *gladly*, for I believe it is one of the highest joys of the minister to know he is of practical benefit to his flock. He deals so much and so often in theory, of necessity, that to get near to some one heart and help it in any way is his best salary. The true minister would go without a meal any time to confirm a wavering faith or soothe a troubled heart.

2. The objection often arises from a reluctance to make the necessary application one's self. The responsibility of doing this in public should not be laid on the shoulders of the minister. Sufficient if he helps by the clear exposition of Gospel principles, by sympathy, and by counsel as occasion serves. To do more would be unjustifiable and unwise, on many obvious accounts:

3. Chiefly because, in the nature of things, great religious principles only can be the proper subjects of public discourse in the pulpit. The application of them can be made in a general way only—not at all in detail.

VI.

We find ourselves seriously affected on hearing of anything bad, outrageous, ungrateful. We are troubled, distressed about it,—we may say injured. And in proportion to our goodness of heart, to our opposition to and hatred of the least deviation from law and order, will be our distress. As we become more spiritually-minded, throbbing tenderly with the sweet pure influences of heaven, we shall become more susceptible to disturbance when receiving intelligence of wrong-doing.

As knowledge increases, as the facilities for collecting and communicating information multiply, these elements of disturbance will very frequently be brought home direct to the hearts of the good; with increasing frequency we may say, until society shall have vastly improved upon its present state. By this means provision is afforded, from a quarter generally unsuspected of supplying it, for perpetual annoyance, some-

times amounting to misery, to certain persons. It is true our happiness, while upon earth, must thus be to some extent dependent upon the contingencies of progress; but it is a fact worth noting, for many reasons, that in the course of that progress—in the general diffusion of intelligence by newspapers for instance, a diffusion becoming more extensive every year—there are provided, of necessity, many checks to a peaceful life. The quiet, uneventful country life, with its calm, unruffled flow from year to year and from age to age, and its sweet, soothing, charm of semi-solitude, except when something uncommonly startling happens, is fast passing away and will soon be past. England, Europe, almost the world, have become to us in many respects as a village.

Individually, we are not gifted with omniscience; yet the ubiquitous press is advancing with rapid strides towards the realization of the idea of omniscience; and so far we may be said to gift ourselves with that attribute. The newspaper presents to us with microscopic minuteness immense areas of society. It photographs the thought and feeling of thousands: it is society's *carte de visite.*

This wider view of society, this insight into places far distant, must draw upon and drain to a fearful extent the reservoirs of human interest and sympathy—must cause in certain persons (the good, for instance, and, in fact, all who are not hardened) constant mental and moral agitation. Reading as so many good people do the records of crime, sin, suffering—all of which they abhor—either the repelling forces of their nature, their enthusiastic indignation, will be roused in various ways natural to them, or the result will be a growing hardness of nature, an indifference to human conduct which of all things is the most to be lamented.

And can we afford either this continual drain upon our sympathies, our mental and moral forces, or the alternative insensibility? If when a person *sees* a wrong done, or beholds immense suffering, he is of necessity deeply moved, must he not also be deeply moved when he *hears* or *reads* of suffering and wrong?—not, it is true, to such an extent in the latter as in the former case; but still the same kind of feelings will be revived, roused within him: unless, indeed, through habitual knowledge of evil he becomes indifferent to it. In the former case there is a continual strain upon the nervous system, the vital forces are wasted, and in the latter a very low type of human nature is perpetuated.

For (the remark is worthy of the emphasis of repetition) the tendency of the habitual reading of crime, or sin, as of

the commission of it is to deaden the natural feelings of the heart, until we can read or hear of, and even see, certain things said or done without any particularly strong emotion and without calling forth any remark, except perhaps a hackneyed phrase or two, such as "Well, I never heard of such a thing!" or "Dear me, how horrible!" The heart assuredly becomes less quick to hate wrong, less ready to show its hatred of it, and less willing to pity the wrong-doers. It is true that millions find considerable excitement in reading of crime, sin, and suffering; a railway accident, an execution, a suicide, or a murder afford them a rich repast; but who will affirm that such excitement is wholesome, beneficial?

With the police court, the divorce court, the bankruptcy court, and other courts, a considerable number of back slums and the goings-on therein, a few murders, a suicide or two, a good supply of drunkards, swindlers, and their doings, wretched homes in abundance, and of accidents not a few, brought regularly to the breakfast table in the guise of a newspaper, it is no wonder to me that it is one of the hardest things to do to keep one's heart fresh and warm, with all natural feelings in healthy action. One cannot always be sympathising nor highly indignant. The vital, nervous forces, which sustain such emotions are exhaustible. Hence the temptation to feel careless, gradually at first, but to an ever-increasing extent, until, perhaps, a hopeless, cynical feeling is superinduced, blighting the fair flowers of manhood, and making winter in the soul. The best thing, then, to do is to drift along with the crowd, content to be blighted. Hence, too, the difficulty of finding in these days a fresh, warm heart, full of all healthy, attractive impulses, in persons of experience. However public men, as doctors, lawyers, ministers, and others, manage to enjoy life—to preserve a healthy, hopeful state of mind and heart is a mystery to me. Ministers especially, I should think, must require a large endowment of what one may call *humanity*, or "enthusiasm of humanity"—great faith in human nature, plenty of surplus energy, sympathy, pity, hopefulness. Verily, such a drain on one's vital forces—what is it but noblest self-sacrifice? Hence, again, the temptation to which we are all exposed to grow gradually insincere in our speech,—to use language of pity and sympathy when the corresponding feelings are very weak, perhaps absent altogether. There is naturally a failure of heart-juices, and one must adulterate: a sad state to get into.

This state of things constitutes a great trial to the good. They are ambitious to keep natural, fresh, everyway and

altogether *human*, but the difficulties in the way are enormous. The strain is almost more than heart can bear: at any rate, he who has established himself in naturalness, in unimpaired play of all sweet human affections and impulses, in spite of the overwhelming weight of knowledge of evil and the huge artificialities of society, is the Hero of heroes unquestionably. Let him be crowned, we say; or, which is better, let him wait awhile till God crowns him.

It is well for us that we are not omniscient. If we were how could we bear the revelations of human life which would follow?—a mystery, that. And yet how must it be with higher intelligences than man, who are supposed to know all about us? Perhaps because they have larger reservoirs of life-force they are able to bear it; and perhaps they see possibilities of good in men hidden from our eyes. And how was it with Jesus, who knew all?—Ah! it is no wonder He was "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief."

As it is, it may help us to remember that much of what we hear and read deserves to be forgotten. Then why is it published? Well, it is published because it pays, editors being, as a rule, strangely regardless of the moral effect of it upon the minds of the public. We look forward to a time when this will be altered. What is wrong deserves to die. Why should man make it immortal? A thousand hidden, beautiful things are waiting for light, that the goodness of men's hearts may be quickened into ruddy bloom. Why not rather give these birth?

Then we are not called upon to indulge in pity and sympathy unless they can take some practical shape. This consideration does not remove the difficulty: it only narrows it; for some *cannot help* but pity and sympathize where it is impossible for them to render any practical aid. Who in the three kingdoms has not felt for and suffered with poor Alice Blanche Oswald, a poor governess, brought over from America and then discharged, an entire stranger in a strange land, who in despair of living a virtuous life, threw herself over Waterloo Bridge into the Thames, and was drowned?—yet none afforded practical help! Still, in such a case, is there not an awful amount of precious sympathy wasted—sympathy which, if directed to some object as pitiful in each person's own neighbourhood, *might* take some practical shape? A vast amount of good feeling is expended to no purpose in reading newspapers which ought to be utilised in individual practical charities.

The difficulty will not be wholly removed till newspapers

refuse to disseminate information of crime and suffering. In the meantime, those who choose have the remedy in their own hands by refusing to read such records,—a wise course to take.

VII.

IT has generally been taken for granted that free-agency and divine sovereignty were necessarily opposed to each other. Controversies have mostly started from that point and have raged round it. Without attempting to explain—what, it may be, is inexplainable—man's free agency, its nature, and so forth, may we not venture to question whether man's free-agency and divine sovereignty need any reconciliation? There was once a dispute among a number of philosophers as to whether fish immersed in water increased the weight of it. The dispute waxed fierce and lasted long. At last, some modest philosopher suggested that they should weigh some water before putting the fishes in, and afterwards; which suggestion, to their honour, was adopted, and the dispute ended. If we weighed well the notions of free-agency and divine sovereignty the dispute as to their "clashing" would, we think, also cease.

It is admitted, of course, that man's free-agency (not now to define it, but meaning what is popularly understood by it), is not absolute, but limited — that man is free only within the limits of his constitution. The idea of limitation is essential to the idea of freedom. All men *can*, but no man *ought* to transgress the laws which govern man: the moment they are transgressed the transgressor binds himself, or loses his freedom so far. The more faithfully all the laws of the human constitution—physical, moral, religious—are observed, the larger and the more blessed becomes human freedom. The truly good man, in consequence, is the freest and happiest man.

"But," it is said, "God's all-embracing purposes are effected outside of and notwithstanding this so-called freedom: and how man can do as he likes, and yet God's sovereign will be effective always, is the puzzle." Now, not to mention (1), that God, having Himself constituted man's free-agency, having Himself fixed the limitations essential to it, cannot and need not do anything inconsistent with it; (2), that it cannot be proved that God, in providence, carries out His purposes independent of and notwithstanding human free-agency; (3) that no man can do as he likes always and retain his freedom of agency unimpaired,—I say without dwelling on these points, it being sufficient for my purpose

just to mention them, may we not find a reason for believing that all attempts at reconciling man's free-agency and divine sovereignty are futile, because unnecessary, in the observation that divine sovereignty works *in and through and by means of the very limitation or limitations* which render such free-agency possible? Some persons have so great a faculty for reading character as to predict with an approach to certainty the line of conduct a certain person will pursue in any given circumstances. Imagine any one of those clever readers of character invested with sovereign power to create those circumstances and put the certain person there, and you have materials at once for as stiff and unprofitable a controversy as to the reconcilement of the one's sovereignty and the other's free-agency as ever agitated the Christian world in the matter under discussion: and with as little reason; for though it is probable, it is not by any means certain that a man will act as it was foreseen he would; and even if he acts as expected—no matter how active anyone may have been in securing the result—his free-agency is preserved as intact as the other's sovereignty. And, *mutatis mutandis*, what is this but to say that free-agency itself is but a mirror reflecting God's absolute sovereignty?—we may say *a part* of it,—at any rate evidencing it to us as nothing else can; and to say, further, that we are acquainted with no purpose of God which has not been or cannot be accomplished within the possibilities of, and consistently with, the constitution He has given us? The laws of the human constitution are the divine charter of human freedom, and it is impossible for God who made them to transgress them in any way.

What is wanted is to get a true notion of free-agency on the one hand and of Divine sovereignty on the other: the rest is easy.

VIII.

THE majority of the people in the cotton manufacturing districts are mill hands—girls and young women. Many of them —most of them—have been in the mill from early youth. Their education is, as it could not well but be, very defective, and in consequence their tastes are low. Their daily programme, as long as their life lasts—which in many cases is not very long—may be thus drawn up: working at the mill, the tramp to and fro, going, leaving off, and at meal times, and sleep; broken occasionally by a visit to a singing saloon, or a walk at night, or an "out" on the Saturday afternoon and at holiday times. As a body they do not live to be old.

Those thrive infinitely the best who stay at home attending to domestic matters (few, however, like this, as wages are good) after finding that mill-work disagrees with them. Taking your stand opposite a large mill at leaving-off time you meet a crowd of young women, whose ages run chiefly from twelve to thirty, with clogs on and shawls over their heads, pale and haggard-looking, and walking with a kind of I-wish-I-could-lay-down walk. Their sallow—in many cases yellow—complexions, dull eyes, and weary, sad aspect, indicate but too plainly that they suffer from indigestion, biliousness, want of fresh air and exercise, and the monotony of their occupation. The hollow cheeks, bony hands, and sunken eyes of some of them (a large proportion) tell that consumption is hard at work: while all lack the spirit and freshness which ought to be the precious heritage of youth. It is one of the saddest sights I know to stand and watch them:—so many human beings without a *human* life. All the sadder is the sight, too, as it is evident some of them feel the weariness, the sadness, the inevitableness of it all; going on their inevitable way, however, silent with the silence of despair,—heroes in humble life, martys to "supply and demand." There are a few fresh faces amongst the crowd (perhaps not the hereditary mill-hands or perhaps comparative strangers), looking all the fresher for the contrast afforded by so many blighted, faded countenances. I suppose we may call such a sight one of the blessings of labour! O, how can some men think of it calmly, look upon it without emotion, and consider it as a "matter-of-course," when they would sooner destroy all the machinery in England than suffer their own children to be mill hands! Every time I see a massive mill, with its innumerable windows, like eyes, staring at me, and hear the inexorable rumble of the hidden machinery, I cannot help thinking of an establishment for grinding humanity down to gold—a devilish alchemy. It is all very well to say that it cannot be helped—that the demand is great and must be supplied—that it is better these people should so live than starve, with many other remarks which can be made by those who are determined at any sacrifice to make money. But it seems to me that by no amount of ingenuity can such men escape the charge of making a trade demand an excuse for creating a state of things which ought to constitute a crime, and no mean one either. Humanity has its demands as well as trade. Which are the higher? the more imperative? Which should be subordinate to the other? Besides, how has the demand been created? Has it not a cause? Who have visited other lands, and found it to their

interest—their money-interest—to encourage the laziness of the inhabitants by offering to do certain work for them, in many cases in return for what costs them comparatively no labour at all? Instead of civilization, or anything half so good, having caused these so-called trade demands, the true cause is oftenest found in the avarice (frequently christened *enterprize)* of men who have it in their power, through command of capital, to screw more and more work out of a class at home already overburdened with work, to make up for the laziness of a people abroad who have been tempted to acquire tastes they will not move a finger to gratify. Where is the honesty, the manliness, of the man, who, after having helped to cause the demand in question, can turn round and say in justification of the daily slavery he has it in his power to impose, "The demand is great and must be supplied?" And after all could not the demand be met without the crime? Is it not too true that because the crime is the easiest way of meeting the demand—it is therefore committed? Have other ways of meeting the demand—ways that would not subordinate soul to trade—been considered? If England will do the world's work cheaper than anyone else the world will be only too glad to let us, and capitalists, if they can profit by it, will be only too willing to invite it and get it done at the sacrifice of whatever sacred thing lies in their way; but is it therefore right that the working population of England should have added to its own legitimate and necessary labour so much of the labour which legitimately belongs to other nations? England occupies a position just now among the nations of the world somewhat analogous to that of the Israelites among the Egyptians. In virtue of her immense and unapproachable activity she may be foremost amongst the nations of the world; but the honour of an activity attended with such lamentable drawbacks, and which, if distributed amongst the nations, would relieve ourselves of much evil and benefit them, is a questionable honour. It seems to me it would be far more honourable to make our home-working population more human by helping to make foreign populations more industrious. Under present conditions of trade and labour the activity of England is nothing to boast of—something to lament, did we see it rightly. We do not say it is wrong to create demand; but no one ought to be injured in any way in creating it. Nor do we say it is wrong to supply demand; but the supply ought to come from the right source, and no one ought to be injured in supplying it.

Where the remedy for it all will come from is a mystery.

Things have drifted into their present state, thousands lamenting, and helplessly lamenting it. It cannot well come from our merchants and capitalists, as they have accustomed themselves to allow commerce and trade extensively to override considerations of humanity, justice, and morality. It cannot well come from government, as legislation is controlled by the dominant thought of the times. Education, as it is becoming general, will undoubtedly do much, in raising the status of the labouring population. The growth of a healthy moral public opinion will effect a revolution in trade and commerce. Already in the numerous strikes of the day, and in the just combination of agricultural labourers for the purpose of improving their condition, we are feeling its powerful throes—indications, these, of what it will achieve in its ripeness. And once let an "enthusiasm of humanity" take possession of the industrious population, and a great many political and social anomalies will be swept away. Human nature will not be ground to powder, human bodies will not be squeezed into graves by the Juggernaut wheel of "supply and demand" then. Things may ripen into a revolution—a rebellion of the crushed—who can tell?—bloodless and silent, perhaps, but none the less a determined Exodus, leaving Egyptian taskmasters and their abettors to be overwhelmed in a Red Sea of Ruin. And we know which side Providence is on: in His goodness He may bring about deliverance in His own wise way.

After all, on this subject, one is able to say infinitely too little or infinitely too much.

IX.

THERE are some who think that by how much a man takes a purely *intellectual* interest in theological matters, by so much he must lack spirituality of mind. Men are divided into classes in consequence of their views or predilections on this matter. Many worthy excellent men have more spiritual than intellectual interest in religion. Their temperament has favoured it, their education has developed it, and habits and prejudices have grown up in connection with it sufficiently marked to render its classification easy. There are other equally excellent worthy men, who by temperament and education take a deeper intellectual than spiritual interest in religion; or to speak more accurately, who, *in addition* to their deep spiritual interest, have also an intellectual interest in religion sufficiently strong to render them a class altogether distinct from the former. Very naturally the former class of men condemn the latter: they say they tread on dangerous

ground, and more than hint they have gone wofully astray: they always assume that an intellectual interest in religion necessarily detracts from spirituality, and that intellectual interest they often confound with rationalism; for "Rationalist" is the term by which they distinguish those who take pleasure in exercising their reason upon religious matters.

But the fact is there are thousands who are religious in the truest and best sense (and their number is increasing) whose tastes are predominantly intellectual, and who cannot with any justice be called rationalists. A rationalist is one who subordinates religion to reason, who constitutes himself a judge of the subject-matter of revealed truth:—a class altogether distinct from that large class who simply stand out as intellectual religionists—men who find in religion boundless scope for delightful intellectual exercise. The one class erect "reason" into a barrier excluding religion from the heart, the other use it, after accepting religion, as a powerful means of spiritual culture.

But the assumption that an intellectual and spiritual interest in religious matters are incompatible deserves attention. Some differ as to the *extent* of this incompatibility; but all belonging to the former class agree as to the principle—that there *is* incompatibility. Assuredly it does not require any reasoning to prove that this *is* an assumption, or a mistake, and that there is no foundation whatever for it in the human constitution, or in fact. Common sense at once declares it impossible to be true, as it implies there is a necessary antagonism between man's intellectual and spiritual natures. With those who go so far as to maintain, or rather not deny, that there is such antagonism we can have nothing to do. Who can believe that in the human constitution there is constant disharmony?—that between the two great divisions of it there is and must be perpetual war? It needs no reasoning to assure oneself that there must be essential agreement between the "soul" and the "spirit." Religion concerns the one as much as the other. No part of our nature is specially adapted to religion: all parts are alike adapted to it. Either part may become a hindrance. It would require a wise man to tell which has been most productive of evil to the world, superstition—the abuse of the spiritual nature, or rationalism—the abuse of the intellectual nature. We have power to exalt the one at the expense of the other, it is true; hence superstition on the one hand and rationalism on the other; but it is also true that in a well-balanced constitution, where all the powers sustain a proper relation the one to the other, each will have a voice, so

to speak, in religious matters. There is an office for the intellect, as for the spirit, in religion.

Personally, I sympathise no more with rationalism, properly understood, than with superstition. Both are to me equally unwarranted and injurious; but—to use the timely and judicious words of Dr. C. J. Vaughan, uttered in February last—"It is too much the fashion with some religionists to speak slightingly of intellect. They do a great dishonour to Christ in this. 'Who made man's mouth?' is the question of God Himself. Who touched with divine fire the lips of the orator, of the poet, of the psalmist? Can one of Gods gifts be at natural variance with another? If there be discord, may it not arise, in part, from the unguarded, the unauthorized utterances of a piety less wise than wilful? Certainly we see that grace itself, trampling on gift, is unequal to the work assigned it. So soon as the world shall say, piety herself permitting it, 'See the utter, the final divorce of learning from religion, of eloquence from preaching, of ability from the Church, of good sense from faith'—from that moment the Gospel itself will become a hissing, and the Church a desolation. 'Covet earnestly the best gifts;' see only that they be accompanied evermore with grace to use them always for God's glory." To which we respond with a hearty Amen.

X.

THERE has often been a great deal said as to the Gospel being unadapted to modern life; much that is difficult to understand, if indeed it can be understood at all. The very notion which is discussed brings before us two incongruous things: the *Gospel*, and *modern life*, incongruous enough, in fact, at present. The Gospel, as we know, is "good news;" but the good news refer to our salvation from sin through Jesus Christ—a salvation which certainly involves obedience to the commands of Christ, or the practice of virtue. It is giving but a poor account of the Gospel to say that it is in harmony with the progressive character of the age, or that it encourages and developes our social nature, or that it is a reviver of morality. In such an account the essential characteristics of the Gospel are not touched upon on the one hand, nor the deep necessities of man on the other. The underlying woe of man is his sinfulness, and the pre-eminent mission of the Gospel is to save man from his sins. Hence the Gospel seeks to put men right, not in their social, political, and moral relations, *as such*, but in their relation to God. It is true at the same time that this right relation God-ward has a reflex influence on every other

relation of man, hallowing and sanctifying every feeling, every desire, and every act. To use the Rev. W. A. Butler's words, "I suppose it may be said with truth, that if any man were to be asked what it is that characterizes Christianity as a practical system distinguishably from all that preceded it, or from all that have followed without imitating it, he might state it correctly enough in two words,—*love* and *sorrow*; the blessedness of mutual affection, and the blessedness of suffering." A divine sadness pervading the soul as the means to a divine joy; a divine humility of soul as a means to a glorious exaltation; a divine purity ever deepening within us preparatory to our admission into a sinless heaven; a divine faith in the Redeemer of men constraining us to self-sacrifice, painful though it be: such is the Gospel of the Son of God, as developed in actual experience.

And such a Gospel cannot well fit into modern life, in its prevailing characteristics. A spirit of irreconcilable opposition to the Gospel pervades modern life; and in this, modern life does not much differ from ancient life. Modern life is composed of men, who, in the mass, are altogether out of sympathy with the Gospel. They do not recognise it as a governing influence; and the few who do are so few in comparison with the great many who do not, as not appreciably to affect our statement. Modern life is in great part scientific, the tendency being very general to believe nothing unless it is proved by experiment or verified by experience. The critical faculty is highly, if not excessively, cultivated, giving rise to a desire—very laudable if it only stopped there—to examine most minutely the foundations of belief. Science and criticism are often connected with scepticism, whether necessarily so or not, we will not say; but in modern life we find them, in fact, in close alliance: and thus allied, creating a state of mind totally unfit to adjudicate upon the spiritual truths of the Gospel. Knowledge of all kinds is widely diffused—a great blessing; but it does not seem to disturb the depths of human nature. The freer, fuller intercourse of modern life promotes activity and increases our acquaintance with the race, giving rise to commerce, to the gigantic commerce of the present day; but out of this grow many evils:—luxury, speculation, excessive competition, affording occasion for tricks of trade and adulteration of goods, a sad dissatisfaction among the non-wealthy classes chiefly, which in one extreme leads to a renunciation of all self-control and individuality, and in the other to excessive self-assertion and self-dependence—this latter no mean cause of the prevailing scepticism. The

religiousness of the age—and here I exclude all who have a conscious faith in Christ, a faith which shows itself to be true by its works—is more a fashion than a life, more a habit acquired by education than a something consciously, heartily chosen; and this occasions much insincerity in action, much self-deception, much hypocrisy, which must ultimately issue in a miserable no-faith. The conditions of society are such that it is extremely difficult to realize a moderate livelihood, not to say competency, unless, indeed, you start a gold-vein somewhere; and in the struggle for life and a fair share of its comforts, both religion and morality are rather extensively made to subserve less important interests. The spirit of modern life, in short, I would denominate an aggrandising, a self-sufficient, a selfish, and an irreverent spirit. One hardly wonders that Mr. Carlyle should say, "England is sunk into an abominable and damnable cesspool of lies, and shoddys, and shams." Millions of men know not their utter hollowness:—respectably veneered, they are blind to the fact that they are rotten-hearted. Unless a man is *true*, what hope is there of him?

What has such a state of things to do with the Gospel? or the Gospel with it?—in the shape of fellowship, mutual toleration?—Nothing. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness! And what communion hath light with darkness?" And we have no fear of the question, Has modern life outgrown the Gospel? To answer in the affirmative is to shut our eyes to notorious facts proving the contrary; for upon an intelligent and a just comparison of the Gospel—its purity, faith, humility, love, and spirituality,—with the state of modern society—its uncleanness, scepticism and disbelief, pride, self-sufficiency, and unlovingness,—we shall be quite satisfied that we have not yet left the Gospel behind us in our upward march, if we may be said to be marching upward at all without it. Modern society, as all society, we should not forget, is an unsettled, unbalanced force. Like the ever-shifting sands of the sea it is ever moving to and fro, obeying some mighty impulse it seldom, if ever, understands. It knows not the nature of the power which urges it along, nor the reason of its exercise. National opinions, habits, modes of thought, rise, reach their meridian, and set; until the night of some dark stagnation is dissipated by the rising of other and not always more glorious systems of thought and popular beliefs. The social life of the people has its periods of repose and of change,—its quiet enjoyments and its propelling excesses,—and the gregarious instincts of the race very often overpower the morality super-

induced by an educational process. But in the midst of this change, there is one thing that changes not: whatever fluctuations of feeling or of thought may afflict or bless society, this unchanging Gospel remains unaffected. It is the characteristic of the one to be in motion; of the other, to be at rest. It is the nature of the one to be dissatisfied, discontented, and to crave after something else in search of something better; of the other, to be calmly assured of an accomplished perfection. The one is the surging, troubled ocean; the other a rock in the midst of it. From the first century to the present the essential truths and principles of the Gospel have remained the same: they are Conservatism itself: and, such is our faith, are likely to remain the same for ever, modern life notwithstanding.

Now which has authority over the other, to bend and subdue it? Which shall be the assimilating force? Which in the long run shall lose itself in the triumph of the other? We believe the Gospel is the all-assimilating influence, the authoritative law to which modern life is to be subject on pain of abiding condemnation. Its mission is to infuse its spirit into society until society is brought into complete harmony with it. The Gospel cannot come down to modern life: modern life must go up to the Gospel; and though in fact the two are now wide as the poles asunder, yet the Gospel asserts that the time shall come when all things shall be in harmony with it. If we are spiritual beings—if we have no right of ownership in ourselves—if this world is but a star in the bright constellation of God's innumerable creations, and but the shadow of the cloud of His glory—if existence derives any significance from the past, and we can see in the present a hand which waves us towards a developing future—if the things which are seen are but many-coloured threads with which God is weaving the web of His great and eternal purposes in His unseen dwelling-place,—if these things are true, then it is also true that in some period of future life the wondrous loveliness of the Gospel shall be reproduced: and perhaps that period is the

> "Far off, divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

In the meantime she proclaims, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein. . . . Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath *clean hands and a pure heart, who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.* He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation."

ART. III.—HENRY WARD BEECHER ON PREACHING.

Lectures on Preaching. Delivered at Yale College, New Haven, Conn. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. London: R. D. Dickenson, 1872.

HENRY WARD BEECHER is acknowledged to be, with almost universal voice, the greatest preacher of the day. He is the Spurgeon of America, as Spurgeon is the Beecher of England. Both, as preachers, are unapproachable; otherwise, however, exhibiting strongly marked contrasts. Spurgeon is a Calvinist; Beecher is not. Spurgeon is sternly, severely orthodox; Beecher, here and there, relaxes his orthodox faith; but both are one in aiming at the same thing—the salvation of men by Christ, and their presentation to the Father pure and perfect. Beecher is much more intellectual than Spurgeon in his mode of presenting the truth, though *intellectuality* cannot be said to be a distinguishing characteristic of his preaching. He lays hold of truth with a firm masterly grasp of intellect, but the more powerful and fiery spirit fuses it and makes it glow with peculiar richness of light. He takes care to inform his students that a strong sympathy with the intellectual elements of the ministry "should never overlie, and certainly should not absorb or impede the more legitimate sympathy they are to have with men themselves." Spurgeon aims directly at the heart; Beecher indirectly, by the route of the intellect. Having captured the intellectual strongholds, he advances with unconquerable power to the inner citadel of the spirit, and takes it without difficulty. The power both wield is immense.

Mr. Beecher is the son of a clergyman and professor of theology. From his father he received his training and education, and so very naturally glided into the ministry as his life-work. He tells us, "I never had any choice about it. My father had eight sons. Only two of them ever tried to get away from preaching, and they did not succeed. The other six went right into the ministry just as naturally as they went into manhood." He spent two years as a minister as Lawrenceburgh, Indiana; eight years at Indianapolis; after which he went to Brooklyn, where he has remained for twenty-five years. In the *Christian Age* for November 6 there is a most interesting account of his "Silver Wedding," or the completion of his twenty-fifth year as the pastor of Brooklyn Church. Dr.

Storrs, who gave him the right hand of fellowship when he first came, made the speech of congratulation on this occasion. "Mr. Beecher opened his mouth to reply, but for once could not speak; looking up into Mr. Storr's face with a countenance that is seldom seen on earth, he chokingly said, 'Brother Storrs,' and flung his arms around his neck and kissed him. Five thousand eyes were flooded with tears." In his historical speech on this occasion, Mr. Beecher gave some important information as to his aims and the main inspiration of his ministry during those twenty-five years. He came from the field of revivals to Brooklyn without plans, without any theories to establish, without a system to found, but determined "to work for the awakening of men, for their conversion to Christ, for their upbuilding in a Christian life." Great success attended his labours. The first year there was a revival, and the history of his church, he says, "has been one of great and glorious revivals of religion." The following extract is well worth quoting, as showing what Mr. Beecher considers the main inspiration of his ministry and principal cause of his success:—

"I will speak of this church in reference to what I think to have been its fundamental inspiration. I should not be just to truth and to Divine witness if I did not affirm my earnest, thorough, and deep conviction that the power of this church has not resided in those things that have most attracted attention. 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation,' and the secret of the life and success of this church has been the full faith of its members in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And in regard to my own ministry, although it has embraced a vast variety of topics, yet it is my personal opinion that it has derived its force simply and mainly from my deep and ardent faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, who to me fills the whole sphere of affection. This has been Christ's Church—an assembly of men whose bond of union with each other has been Jesus Christ among them. In preaching Christ in the ministration of this Church the emphasis has been given to love, which aforetime was given to theology in New England. In the theology of New England conscience has been the predominant influence, and conscience is intimately connected with fear; but partly from my own experience and partly from other sources, scarcely knowing what I did, I changed the emphasis, and put the emphasis of my preaching upon the great truth of the Divine love, made that the primary, and conscience and fear only secondary, and the love of Jesus Christ has been the first, middle, and all in every relation whatever."

His influence in the United States can hardly be estimated by us in England, where social and political conditions of life present almost innumerable contrasts with those of America.

Consistently enough with his own conception of preaching, as we shall see, he takes an interest, deep and abiding, in everything affecting man and his progress. Politics, science, art, he freely criticises and uses in his great life-work. He touches men on every side. Human nature is his first lesson-book; nature, philosophy, science, and art his second, third, fourth, and fifth books. From these he draws innumerable illustrations of spiritual things. He studies all classes of people and *everything;* for life everywhere, and in all its forms, is of God's creating and upholding, and can and must be made available to the highest of all earthly business—man-building. Dr. Storrs, speaking at his silver wedding of Mr. Beecher's character and work, ascribes his power, first, to a "thoroughly vitalized mind—so vitalized that every process becomes vital;" secondly, to "immense common sense—a wonderful self-rectifying judgment that gives sobriety and steadiness to all its powers of thought;" thirdly, to his "quick sympathy with men"—"an intuitive perception into the minds of men which makes their modes of thought stand out like visible persons in the street;" fourthly, to a "responsiveness which makes him ready for every occasion;" fifthly, to his "wonderful animal vigour;" sixthly, to his "voice, which can thunder or whisper;" seventhly, to his "sympathies with nature;" and "above all these his enthusiasm for Christ."

To possess his views on preaching is no common privilege. His lectures are not a dry text-book on homiletics, but a most interesting *resumé* of his own experience and observation, humourous here, autobiographical there, and original throughout. Every way marvellous, but nevertheless attractive, his breaking away with all the delight and freedom of youth from the stiff conventionalities of ecclesiasticism, against which he now thunders in wrath and at which he then laughs till his sides ache again. Strong common sense, of which he has an extraordinary endowment, lit up by the light of true genius, fixes at once upon the best methods of working in given circumstances; for, like all wise men, he adapts himself to his own circumstances, if he cannot make his circumstances adapt themselves to him, which, on the whole, he prefers and generally succeeds in doing, and advises every preacher to do the same.

He has an exalted conception of ministerial work. With him preaching is something more than teaching. A preacher is a man who works upon the spirits of men—an "artist of the soul." His end is soul-building. This conception is stated and re-stated with all variety of expression and emphasis. A "reconstructed manhood," *manhood* rather than "higher life,"

because Christian life should not be distinguished from "the movement of the whole being:" such is his idea of the ministry, the key-note of his theology and homiletics. His sympathies are all man-ward. He girdles his congregation round with the girdle of his sweet humanities, and so lures them, by the gentlest of bonds, to a higher life. The non-success of many eminently thoughtful ministers is due to the fact that "their sympathy ran almost exclusively toward God," apologising for, vindicating, defending Him, as though they were "God's attorneys;" or to the fact that they had too great a sympathy with "ideas, with organized thought, religious system, or philosophy." Sympathy with *men* is the fundamental requisite of ministerial success. Paul had it in perfection, who "would have said, had he spoken modern English, 'I know how to fit myself to every sinuosity and nugacity of every single disposition with which I have to deal; you cannot find me a man so deep or so high, so blunt or so sharp, but I would take the shape of that man's disposition in order to come into sympathy with him, if by so doing I could lift him to a higher and a nobler plane of life.'" This idea of *sympathy with men* is the root-idea of Mr. Ward Beecher's homiletic philosophy, and branching out of that in gorgeous profusion are all his methods, hints, practices, and his activities as a minister.

It cannot be doubted that Mr. Beecher's view of a minister's chief business—"man-building"—will be considered by many to clash with the evangelical notion of it—"soul-saving." There are indications that in the earlier years of his ministry he himself laid most stress upon the latter notion, and that he has since then gradually been led to adopt the former; not necessarily to the exclusion of the notion of "soul-saving," perhaps to the inclusion of it, but certainly over and above it, making the conception of "man-building" the sun, that of "soul-saving" a star of the first magnitude revolving round it: a conception of ministerial work attended with some peculiar dangers. It inevitably embraces every part and branch of human life. Very consistently, therefore, does Mr. Beecher demand a "broad" pulpit. "I claim that the pulpit has a right and a duty to discuss social questions, moral questions in politics, slavery, war, peace, and the intercourse of nations. It has a right to discuss commerce, industry, political economy, and everything from the roof-tree to the foundation-stone of the household, and everything that is of interest in the State. . . . . There is not so broad a platform in the world as the Christian pulpit:" such subjects not to occupy the chief place, but only *some* place, the real secret of power in

the pulpit after all being "the preaching of the invisible God to the people as an ever-present God." Such a conception will of course fashion one's conception of truth generally, both scriptural and secular, into harmony with itself; indeed, we can easily see how every secular thing (so called) becomes sacred, and *vice versa*. It will also, we fear, lead to a gradual modification or re-arrangement of evangelical truth, if not to a different notion of "evangelicism" altogether to that now current amongst us, a modification already made by our author both with regard to evangelical truth and the notion of evangelicism. Hence the danger of putting into the shade the gospel revelation of salvation from sin by faith in Christ as the one most effectual means of man-building—a danger the most to be dreaded. With Mr. Beecher himself there may be no danger of this: he may preserve in perfect balance the various parts of his system with all the skill of a master mind; but the thousand ministers who come after him and look up to him, not having his master-mind, lacking his self-controlling faculty, his clear insight, may, instead of governing their system, be governed by it; and with what result? Perhaps, very probably, as only *cautions* prevent them rushing into the danger, a secularized ministry, a political and scientific lectureship, the salvation of men from sin becoming an incidental part of the means of man-building.

Undoubtedly there are many advantages connected with Mr. Beecher's view. It gives breadth and attractiveness to the pulpit; it causes ministers to look more favourably upon science—upon every branch of human life; it keeps the pulpit in advance of the age, for "there is one fact that is not going to be overturned by science, and that is the necessity of human development and the capability there is in man of being opened up and developed."

Mr. Beecher brings himself within the pale of Evangelicism in this way:—The two great divisions of the Christian Church, commonly called Protestant and Catholic, he denominates Evangelical and Hierarchical; the former relying substantially for its success upon "the living force of man upon man," the latter upon "the administration of ordinances and systems of worship." The Hierarchists discard the sermon; the Evangelicals depend upon it chiefly; and rightly so, for "when you consider that preaching means the living power of living men upon living men, you will see that they who have power in the pulpit have the very heart of the matter." This adroit division, by which Mr. Beecher includes himself among the Evangelicals, seems to us very like saying, "Orthodoxy is my

'doxy." Not that we cannot see some appropriateness in the division, nor wish him God-speed as an earnest-hearted labourer in the Lord's vineyard. We can see a great deal of truth in his views. Man-building is, doubtless, the great work of every Christian, and the great life-work of the Christian minister. The salvation of men from sin is but a part of it; the chief part, however, without which there can be no man-building at all—the foundation of it, without question. The gospel must be preached before man-building, of the higher kind, can commence; or, rather, that man-building of the highest kind may commence. The Gospel, the Creeds, the Philosophies, the Sciences, the Sects, are all for *men*, not men for *them*. The "artist of the soul" must manipulate them all to the building up of good, holy character. This is the minister's work, looked at in its comprehensive results. As we have indicated, Mr. Beecher's danger, and the danger of all who follow him, is to look at the *result*, a perfect man, a deal more than at the chief means to it, redemption by Christ and faith in Him. Still, must we not ourselves frankly confess that we have looked far too exclusively at the *means*—at only *one* of them, though the chief—as though they were, or it was, the *result*? Has not conversion been considered not only the beginning but the *end* of man-building. That Mr. Beecher has, or at least had in his younger days, a due sense of the importance of conversion, both for ministers and people, the following words will show:—

"I went out, on Brother Jewett's call, from Indianapolis to Terre Haute; and I worked there three weeks in a revival until my heart was on fire; and it rained a stream of prayer all the way home from Terre Haute to Indianapolis. It was like an aurora borealis, I have no doubt, ray upon ray, for that whole distance, if angels could have seen it. I was in that feeling all the way—'Lord, slay me if thou wilt; but I will be slain or will have life and salvation among my people.' . . . On Wednesday night I preached again with more power, and called for enquirers at the close; one poor little thin servant girl stopped. She smelt of the kitchen, and looked kitchen all over. When I dismissed the congregation my first feeling, I know, as I went towards her, was one of disappointment. . . The next minute I had an overwhelming revulsion in my soul, and I said to myself, 'If God pleases, I will work for the poorest of his creatures. I will work for the heart of a vagabond, if I am permitted to do it, and bring him to Christ Jesus."

"When, under the gospel, men are made preachers, God works in them a saving knowledge of Himself, gives them a sense of the sympathy between God and man, of the spiritual love which appeals from the infinite to the mortal; and then says to them, 'Take this

revelation of Jesus Christ in you, and go out and preach it.' Tell what God has done for your soul; not in a technical way, but in a large way; take the truth revealed in you, and according to the structure of your understanding, your emotive affections, the sentiments of your own soul, filled with the power of the Holy Ghost, go and preach to men for the sake of making them know the love of Christ Jesus, and you will have a power in you to make that preaching effective."

We have dwelt thus long on this point, as it is the key to all the rest of the book. All Mr. Beecher's important observations, his most valuable advices, are based on or branch out of his comprehensive conception of ministerial work. This must be kept in mind.

His notion of a "call" to the ministry is "the possession of those qualities which make a good minister—good sense, good nature, good health, and downright moral earnestness." Exactly; but he lays no stress upon the inward call proceeding from the Spirit of God. He does not even mention it, except in the following terms:—Young men "think about it (being ministers) a good while, and at last it is borne in upon them, without any special reason, that they had better preach; and they resolve to do it. These are young men who ordinarily cannot form judgments deliberately." This looks like casting a slur upon all feeling or conviction with reference to a "call," supposed to proceed from the Spirit of God. Doubtless many think they are called whom the Lord does not call, nor man either; their conceit exceeds their natural aptitudes; and perhaps Mr. Beecher refers to these. We trust he does, though the above words are not qualified in any way.

The second lecture is on the Qualifications of the Preacher, in which Mr. Beecher makes the "call" to consist, and contains many forcible and beautiful observations. Very properly he lays most stress upon the *character* of the minister. Character is before sermons: "Manhood is the best sermon." Sound, beautiful, attractive character is primary; sermons are secondary. The philosophy of this lies in the nature of religion itself; for, according to our author—

"Religion is harmonized human nature. It includes every element which manhood includes. It is wholesomeness of soul. It is manhood on a higher plane. It includes the physical, the social, the intellectual, the æsthetic, the moral, the spiritual. The whole man working in harmony with the laws of his condition—that is the New Testament idea of a Christian man."

Or, rather, Henry Ward Beecher's idea; for we should have to look long in the New Testament for directions as to physiology,

politics, and art, so full and clear and imperative as those upon spiritual matters to be found there in abundance. If religion is made to embrace *every* department of thought and of feeling, we fear it will be lost altogether—swallowed up entirely in the surging sea of human activities. At the same time there can be no harmonized human nature without religion. Every department of human thought and activity will be affected by it; and if this is what Mr. Beecher means, we agree with him.

They, therefore, make a great mistake who put sermons first,—who address themselves to the production of great sermons, under the impression that to show off in the pulpit is the minister's proper work. "Great sermons, young gentlemen, ninety-nine times in a hundred, are nuisances. They are like steeples without any bells in them; things stuck up in the air, serving for ornament, attracting observation, but sheltering nobody, warming nobody, helping nobody." Given a noble spiritual character and sympathy with men, and sermons of the right kind will multiply. Theology is good—as a "tool." "Sermons are mere tools"—helpful in *saving men*, the true business. Theology, books, principles, facts, systems, constitute a storehouse, from which the living preacher takes his medicine for sick souls: the *prescription* is a distinct thing altogether. The preacher is a *prescriber*. Out of all this will grow variety of pulpit address and also purity of style—naturalness of address.

He enumerates the preacher's qualifications, including high personal character and sympathy with men, as follows: (1) Fruitfulness in moral ideas; (2) the power of moving men —"quick sympathy, apprehensiveness of man, intuition of human nature;" (3) living by faith, or the "sense of God, of eternity, of heaven;" (4) good health and fair common sense; (5) willingness to serve in the humblest sphere.

Two chapters, one on Health, the other on the Study of Human Nature, may be classed under the qualifications of the preacher, and very naturally branch out from our author's main conception. The relation of health to brain-work is receiving great attention just now. One judge—Willes—has, it is supposed, succumbed to over-pressure of work, by committing suicide, and another—Penzance—has been obliged to retire from the bench, for the same reason, it is supposed. The *Times*, the *Lancet*, the *Spectator*, have discussed the subject. It is admitted that the pressure of brain-work in our public men is enormous; and though ministers have not been named, yet some of them—the more popular of them—suffer immensely from this cause. Charles H. Spurgeon—a

colossal worker—is now recruiting his health in the south of France, and we trust he will come back fully restored to health. A public man in these days of excessive activity is a private martyr. Ambition is its own punishment. Martyrdoms innumerable, of the painfullest sort, are constantly endured through excessive brain-work. Health is a prime requisite for active, public men—especially for ministers, for, as Mr. Beecher very justly observes, "It is impossible for a man who is an invalid to sustain a cheerful and hopeful ministry among his people. An invalid looks with a sad eye upon human life. He may be sympathetic, but it is almost always with the shadows that are in the world. He will give out moaning and drowsy hymns. He will make prayers that are almost all piteous." Health will (1) enable a man to "see more sharply the truth he is after;" (2) make him "sensitive to social influences and to social wants;" (3) discover to him "instinctively man's necessities;" (4) make him "quick to choose the instrument by which to minister to those necessities;" (5) make him "accurate in his thinking;" (6) give him power to preach well, for he "needs to put the truth in such a way that if a man were asleep it would wake him up; and if he were dead, it would give him resurrection for the hour. A man that breaks his back-bone every time he explodes a vowel, how can he do it?" (7) makes a man cheerful and hopeful; (8) gives him healthful views of Christianity—makes him "the happiest person in the world." He advises his students to find out what does and what does not "obstruct their mental operations," and to be guided in their eating accordingly. The same rule holds in regard to sleep, it being a rule that nervous, quick organizations require less, and lymphatic organizations more sleep. "You must administer sleep to yourselves, according to your temperament, your constitution, and your wants." He strongly disfavours night study;—"more than eighty per cent. of ministers, who indulge in night study, abbreviate their lives, weaken their tone, and take away from themselves the fulness of their power." Sermons should not be prepared on Saturday night, as the brain is then highly excited for two days, with a "black Monday" in prospect. All excitement should be met, not by cessation from work—a running-down process—but by a counter-excitement. He advises for the Sabbath Day a training for *condition* as well as for thought, his own practice being to spend his Saturday pleasantly. He can generally sleep after preaching; but if he experiences any difficulty, he gets out of bed and walks about awhile till nearly chilled. If this is not

sufficient, he puts his feet and ankles in cold water, to draw the blood from the brain; and if necessary, sits down in his bath in cold water. Sleep must be had somehow, for "if you do not sleep first or last, your audiences will."

Speaking of the study of human nature—a most important qualification, the knowledge of it—Mr. Beecher ventures to predict that the school of future preahers will be a "*Life School*," as contradistinguished from the Ecclesiastical School—those "who regard the church on earth as something to be administered, and themselves as channels in some sense of Divine grace, to direct the flow of that Divine institution"— and the Dogmatic School, or "those who apparently proceed on the supposition that their whole duty is discharged when they have made a regular and repetitious statement of all the great points of doctrine from time to time." Preaching, with the "Life School" preachers will proceed upon the necessity, "first, to study the strengths and the weaknesses of human nature minutely; and then to make use of such portions of the truth as are required by the special needs of man." The "Life School" preachers will aim at understanding *men*, for the purpose of lifting them on to a higher plane. Into the examination of Mr. Beecher's views on the relation of the development of society in these centuries to the truth of the Bible, and of the Apostle's declaration to know nothing among men save "Jesus Christ and him crucified," we cannot now enter. All that we can say is that his views are peculiar, and need examination. His special reasons for studying human nature, and which are powerful enough, are these: (1) "Because it is the Divine nature we are to interpret to men," a nature which must be reached through the human; (2) because all government, human and Divine, is based on human nature, and to understand the one we must understand the other; (3) because there is "the need of the transformation of man's nature by the Divine Spirit," for the moment you discuss the question, What is sin? you are discussing human nature; (4) because a minister in the exercise of his vocation "is obliged to approach the human soul," to rouse it and cure it, which cannot be done effectually without this knowledge; (5) because the study of human nature is becoming a part of a liberal education, and ministers cannot afford to lag behind in knowledge.

In gaining this knowledge it is necessary to study facts scientifically; and as the best aid to this he recommends the study of phrenology in conjunction with physiology and metaphysics. From reading his sermons we have long suspected that phrenology has had no little influence with him in the formation of some of his principal views; and in the volume before us he says of it,—

"When the question comes up *how* to study mental philosophy, I do not know anything that can compare in facility of usableness with phrenology. . . . Nothing can give you the formulated analysis of mind as that can. . . . For twenty years, although I have not made it a special study, it has been the foundation on which I have worked."

From our own knowledge of phrenology and experience of its value, we can heartily endorse Mr. Beecher's statements; and every student would do well to acquaint himself somewhat with that system.

We now turn to Mr. Beecher's views of the preacher's *work* distinctively, and the things affecting it; but we can but briefly touch upon them. In the chapter on the Personal Element in Oratory, which discusses the various modes of bringing one's self to bear on others from the pulpit, the adapting one's self, mentally and spiritually, to the physical and mental idiosyncracies of the congregation, many wise and suggestive remarks are made, well worth pondering, as to different classes of hearers, and how to meet them—the necessity of having churches adapted for speaking—of being unconscious of one's self—and of having the congregation as close to the preacher as possible; all of which we cannot notice in detail. They are generally excellent, and well worth studying by both ministers and people. He dislikes pulpits—"those old-fashioned swallows' nests on the wall"—or a little distance from it; and our dislike of them is as strong as his. An open platform is no small element in effective preaching.

The chapter on Psychological Elements is very instructive. The most important of them he considers is Imagination—imagination in relation not to art or beauty, but to moral truth. Thus exercised it becomes the "true germ of faith;" it becomes "the power of conceiving as definite the things which are invisible to the senses;" also of presenting them to others. Among which things are our notions of God the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, and of God in Christ. This power is essential to presenting Christ to men, so that they shall be conscious of Christ's presence with them. Men are not to be put off by the presentation of an historical Christ, or by a philosophy of Christ, or by a doctrinal Christ. Christ must *live* before them, so that they see Him as their loving Saviour; all which demands power of imagination—"one of the most vital elements of a successful ministry." Then comes the power of feeling—Emotion, on which he lays great stress. "A minister without feeling is no better than a book. You might just as well put a book, printed in large

type, on the desk where all could read it, and have a man to turn over the leaves as you read, as to have a man stand up and clearly and coldly recite the precise truth through which he has gone by a logical course of reasoning." Methodists are not noted for too great reticence in this particular; but with many among us the "dignity of the pulpit," against which Mr. Beecher aims his ridicule, restrains the exhibition of emotion. No dignity is sacrificed when the objects of the ministry are gained; and it is no longer a question that those objects are most speedily gained where there is adequate display of feeling. *Enthusiasm* is Mr. Beecher's third psychological element, necessary to a successful ministry. *Faith*, in the sense of *belief*, is the fourth—the absence of doubt, hesitation, uncertainty. On all these points he gives some excellent advice, in his own original racy style.

Mr. Beecher does not sympathise with those who undervalue rhetorical drill and academical training, though he would by no means have the preacher an actor, for "the actor's ends are but the preacher's means." Judging by results we should think the voice is seldom made a special object of culture among ministers generally. The author's description will apply to many:—

> "A great many men commence preaching under a nervous organism. They very speedily rise to a sharp and hard monotone; and then they go on through their whole sermon as fast as they can, never letting their voices go above or below their false pitch, but always sticking to that, until everybody gets tired out, and they among the rest."

He advises his students to acquire the *habit* of using the voice without effort throughout its whole range, so as to ease themselves and the congregation, and especially to give effect to the truths uttered. The "explosive" tones of the voice are of great value, and worth acquiring. In illustration he relates an incident of Dr. Humphrey, President of Amherst College. Speaking on one occasion in respect to the treatment of Indians, he "suddenly ceased his argument, and exclaimed, 'The voice of the people will be lifted up, and they shall say to the government, YOU SHA'NT!'" "He let it out like a bullet, and the whole chapel was hushed for a moment, and then that rustle followed which showed that the shot had struck. It has remained in my memory ever since." Mr. Beecher informs us that he himself was thoroughly drilled in the management of his voice by Professor Lovell for a period of three years; also in posturing and gesture. He and his brother were accus-

tomed to frequent a grove, where they "exploded" all the vowels from the bottom to the top of their voices. He is peculiar fortunate in having been exempt from the clergyman's sore throat or "minister's bronchitis," for the prevention of which and for keeping up the power of the voice, he recommends maintenance of wholesome habits, keeping the neck tough, cold effusions daily on the head, and an unstrained use of the voice.

The chapter on Illustrations is one of the most valuable in the book. Mr. Beecher is pre-eminent in the use of illustrations, of which he seems to possess an inexhaustible supply. Much of the attractiveness and power of his sermons are due to the skilful use of them. He urges upon his student-auditory the constant use of them, as being helpful in many ways. Sermons are certainly wonderfully lightened by their use, and truth clothed in them is doubly attractive. Yet the fact that those who use illustrations extensively are eminent men, as a rule, proves how deficient ministers generally are in capacity to use them. Sermon-making, when the ministry is long, is certainly a drain upon a man's resources, and all the helps possible are necessary to render it easy and agreeable. And when we speak of "helps" we do not allude to volumes of "outlines," but to legitimate training, and the aptitudes which result. In reference to the ever-recurring question of written or unwritten sermons, Mr. Beecher decides in favour of the latter, though not wholly to the exclusion of the former method. He consequently favours an extemporaneous delivery, it being supposed that the minister *has something to teach.* This reduces the labour of preaching, and prevents a man being the slave of two weekly sermons. Cut-and-dried methods of sermonizing are useless, in his opinion, the plan being determined by a variety of circumstances. "Week after week, month after month, year after year, when the text is announced every child in the congregation, almost as well as the minister himself, can tell that it will be divided into 'First,' 'Secondly,' and 'Thirdly,' together with, 'Then certain practical observations.'" He prefers expository preaching, as doing fullest justice to the Bible, and as allowing great diversity of topics. "Show" sermons are, he says, "Nebuchadnezzar sermons, over which the vain preacher stands, saying, 'Is not this great Babylon that I have builded for the home of the kingdom, by the might of my power and for the honour of my majesty?' Would to God that these preachers, like Nebuchadnezzar, might go to grass for a time, if, like him, they would return sane and humble!"

Mr. Beecher's answers to questions proposed by the students and others at the close of each lecture form one of the most interesting portions of the book. His extreme quickness of perception, immediate grasp of subject, and instant readiness of reply are here remarkably manifest. As in this way he conveys much instruction to all interested in theology and sermonizing, we pick out the gist of the more important answers. Calvinism is his abhorence—that is, the system which *is* Calvinism, though not the system which is *called* Calvinism. He is a Calvinist in this way: "I believe what John Calvin would have believed if he had lived in my time and seen things as I see them. My first desire is to know what is true; and then I am very glad if John Calvin agrees with me; but if he don't, so much the worse for him! . . . John Calvin had an inordinate share of intellect and not half his share of heart;"—a free-and-easy method this of harmonizing discordant elements, efficient enough if Calvinists will only believe in it. Election and predestination should be preached as they are found "in the New Testament." "I would not ask the catechisms, which are helps to those whom they help. . . . Whatever else you do, don't slam the door of possibility (of salvation) in any man's face. If we would obtain the power of adapting ourselves to others, we must *practice* adaptation, for preaching "is a thing to be learned, both in general principles and practical details;" nor must a young minister "be discouraged if he works three or four years in a parish before he really begins to get the control of things." (N.B.—In our Methodist Circuits ministers have to be a little quicker than that.) Short pastorates are not desirable; "but if a man has only a little in him, and is not going to have any more, I think his removal is a great mercy to his parish." Ministers should be *en rappart* with the people; for "it is a part of the intuition of the true preacher to know how to get at men. He looks at a man as Hobbs looked at a lock, who always asked himself, 'How can I pick it?'" Science has not, in his opinion, demonstrated the imperfection of phrenology; on the contrary, "those who are best acquainted with it are conscious that, with some crudeness, it contains a great many elements of truth, and it is one of the tendencies in the right direction." If a preacher has no enthusiasm, he must "do the best he can (in preaching), and stop." *Apropos* of "getting up" enthusiasm by vehement gestures and emphasis, he tells a good story. One Sunday his father, when he got home, said, "It seems to me that I never made a worse sermon than I did this morning." "Why, father,"

said young Henry, "I never heard you preach so loud in all my life." "That is the way" replied the father, "I always holloa when I haven't anything to say!" He approves of the appointment of professional revivalists, if he employs them; if they employ him, he does not like it. They are useful in "scattered neighbourhoods," and in churches which are "run down." The use of encyclopedias of illustrations is allowable, if one is improved in their use. Illustrations are sometimes best written out, sometimes best given extemporaneously; but notes of illustrations are confusing, for "you cannot extemporize while you are thinking of anything other than the impulse which is carrying you on" Special services for children are a requisite and should be held We have remarked, as well as others, that Mr. Beecher very seldom, if ever, gives a quotation of poetry in his sermons, and we were rather curious to hear the reason why. He considers them unnecessary chiefly because the determination to "have a definite quantity of them will kill inspiration in the very egg." The patience of the people is the true guide to the length of sermons Four hours study daily—"but it must be *study*"—is as much as a man can bear, on the average. Ministers, as a rule, study too much Saturday and Monday should not be study days. Every minister must find out his own way of sermonizing. Mr. Beecher's practice is to study on Sunday morning and afternoon for the same day's work. He tried other plans, but failed, and as a last resort took to Sunday morning and afternoon, and succeeded. This habit was accompanied, however, with another—"that of regular study and continual observation." The proportion of written to unwritten sermons should be about "one-third written to two-thirds unwritten." This, of course, applies more to a settled pastorate than to the itinerancy; though, for many reasons, we think it would be a great advantage to Methodist congregations were there no itinerancy of sermons. Books of sermon-plans "will help you when you know how to use them; that is, when you don't need them"—a wise deliverance. Being asked, "Would you preach 'He that believeth not shall be dammed?'" he replies, "Yes, sir, assuredly. I always preach with a shadow. There is always an alternative. . . . . These questions that you are propounding all come on the supposition that to preach in a spirit of love means that there is to be no punishment. It does not mean any such thing. The spirit of love carries everything with it. It carries punishment with it, but in a qualified form, even as love carries it, though not as fear does, nor as conscience does, nor as pure intellect does."

The last chapter is on "Love, the Central Element of the Christian Ministry," and fitly crowns a series of lectures, which, on the whole, are among the most instructive and interesting we have seen, and which cannot fail to have a powerful influence on the rising ministry. Many statements seem to us open to question in addition to those we have already taken exception to; but our aim was not so much to criticise as to lay before our readers the views of the most eminent (as some believe) preacher of the day. We have not had space to do more than just touch upon the chief points here and there. The book, however, is cheap, and every one may at little cost of money and not much of trouble, become more fully acquainted with our author; a course we earnestly recommend all whom it may concern to take.

Art. IV.—THE SMALLER DENOMINATIONS.

There have been signs of late years on the part of some of the churches of an increasing yearning after a larger visible or ecclesiastical unity. Asperities between these churches have been subdued, their rivalries and exclusiveness have been moderated, and a stronger friendliness has been established between them. This improved feeling has led on to the frequent utterance of the desire that some of the sects, having much resemblance to each other, may be joined in one ecclesiastical family. Doubtless a variety of motives and influences combine to strengthen this desire. We would fain think it has its main spring in that increase in the spiritual life which yearns for closer spiritual union and effort. There is nothing which has more influence in bringing down undue exaltation of ecclesiastical distinctions and principles than the enlargement of Christian charity. While a true catholicity will freely recognise and rejoice in real excellence wherever it can be found, it also grieves over unnecessary divisions of sects and names. Then in so far as lower motives operate to increase this desire for outward oneness, there is in many persons a love of largeness for its own sake; aggrandisement carries its own attraction. If competition can be lessened, and some of the sects can be displaced or absorbed, those likely to gain by this process will no doubt help it on. It is probable of not a

few belonging to the smaller bodies that considerations of social convenience will incline them to favour an alliance with sects of greater social attractiveness and power. But we had better not carry the analysis of motives further. Be the causes what they may evidently there is a strong current of feeling which has its flow in favour of increased ecclesiastical uniformity and comprehension.

We can hardly affect surprise that this feeling, in its extreme degrees at least, leads many persons to depreciate the causes which have originated and still perpetuate denominational difference. They are unwilling to understand the nature of these causes or to admit their force. The conclusion they have formed is that outward union is the grand essential; ecclesiastical peace must be gained at any price. From such a basis of judgment it is easy to discern the opinions which follow. Sects and divisions are deplored. Denominational distinctions meet with indiscriminate and hasty censure. The lesser denominations in particular are regarded as indefensible. It is assumed they have been guilty of unwarrantable independence. The references to them imply not a little of reproach and blame. They are spoken of with affectations of sorrow and sometimes with indications of contempt; but the meaning of the language employed, when stripped of its softer disguises, is, that the smaller bodies should surrender their separate existence and make an unconditional return to the larger bodies from which they have departed.

We venture to demur to this mode of reference to the small denominations. It has about it a savour of assumption and arrogance. It implies, with no attempt at discrimination, a justification of the larger denominations and a condemnation of the lesser ones we are by no means ready to admit. The judgment in these cases seems to rest upon the erroneous basis that principles are right as they are popular. But the righteousness or unrighteousness of a cause is not determined by the number of its adherents. Of course the large bodies may have right on their side, and the smaller bodies the reverse; but the largeness of the following does not make the right, nor does the smallness of the following make the wrong. If such a principle of judgment be admitted, then heathenism is better than Christianity. On the same principle Roman Catholicism is better than Protestantism; the Established Church is superior to Dissent. But the prevalence of religions, or the magnitude of churches, is not the proof of their purity or truth. History teaches us that frequently, we may say generally, the larger the ecclesiastical organization has become

and the more it has grown to be a refuge for error and a shelter for moral laxity. Unhappily the deteriorating process has often taken place in churches. They have become puffed up with pride, corrupted by worldly indulgence and interest, lax in discipline, and full of error. The spiritual degeneracy has gone on until they have prostituted their influence to the support of social wrongs, of political injustice and tyranny, and to the shelter and defence of slavery itself. How then have great principles and truths been rescued from their peril and saved from defeat and obscurity? By division and secession. The encroachments of error and laxity have provoked the opposition of the defenders of truth and purity, and at length a crisis has come, when the faithful few in connection with the Church, unable to expel the wrong elements out of her, and finding that further communion would lead to guilty compromise, have in conscience felt bound to secede. But with whom does the blame of secession in such cases rest? Is it not with those who refuse to renounce their laxity and error? who stubbornly hold to things wrong and untrue? The real creators of division, secession, revolution, are those who support unlawful interests and false opinions, and thus make it impossible for good men and true to act in unison with them. The odium attaching to some extreme social and political changes must be placed chiefly upon those who have upheld systems of oppression and injustice. With whom lies the blame of the great division which took place at the time of the Reformation? With the Roman Catholic Church which refused to give up its errors and sins. On whom rested the responsibility of forcing a secession of two thousand clergymen at one time from the Established Church of England? On those who passed the odious Act of Uniformity. What renders dissent from this Established Church justifiable now? In addition to the objections to be raised against the principle of the State establishing any form of religion, and also to the mode in which the principle is applied by our own nation, there is in these times an objection to be raised of the utmost force, that this church is rapidly losing its Protestant character, and while increasing in ecclesiastical rigidity and narrowness, is also expanding to a doctrinal comprehensiveness, threatening to be most fatal to the interests of truth. It offers a refuge and gives legal security to teachings in utter conflict with each other, and provides ample resources alike for those who belong to the Rationalistic or Romanistic extremes. Professor Plumptree, at the late Church Congress in Leeds, said, "It has been ruled, as you all know, that a clergyman may hold and

teach that the language of the baptismal service is only hypothetical and contingent—that prayers for the dead are not forbidden—that all questions as to the extent and nature of inspiration of Scripture as a whole, and the authorship and accuracy of any part of it, are absolutely open—that to hold a belief in the possible restoration of those who pass from this world with souls ignorant, stunted, impenitent, does not involve the forfeiture of a right to minister in our Church. Lastly, that there might be even-handed justice all round, the Bennett judgment has affirmed that in those other 'curious and unhappy differences' of the Eucharistic controversy the church of England 'does not exclude' doctrine which most certainly she does not teach." The Bennett decision legalises the most complete latitudinarianism. Those who teach "the doctrine of the real, actual, objective presence of Christ's body and blood, under the form of bread and wine, at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," are now protected from legal assault; while the number of the clergy supporting such teaching is constantly increasing. How can persons who believe in purity, definiteness and harmony of doctrines, maintain union with a Church which allows such license and conflict of teaching? We cannot better indicate their duty than by quoting the trenchant words of the Rev. Capel Molyneux, late a distinguished clergyman of this Church:—

"If the Church of England is to abide as she is;—a monstrous combination of truth and error—of Protestantism and Romanism—of light and darkness—of testimony for Christ, and yet also testimony against Christ;—if this must needs be so, then I solemnly, seriously, and as in the sight of God, ask, *what is our* DUTY? Momentous question! I presume not to answer it for any other man living; nor to judge any other man living for the answer, be it what it may, which he may feel it right to give; but I do presume to answer the question for myself; and that with perfect confidence; and the answer is:—SECESSION *is my* DUTY."

We hold then, not that there are diminishing, but increasing reasons to justify dissent. And those who declaim so strongly against division should be careful to assign to the right quarter the condemnation due to it. If blame be due to the divisions of dissent, it must be cast upon the Church which by her state alliance, her retention of errors, and her glaring laxity of discipline, makes secession from her a duty to conscience and truth. We have witnessed in our own generation the formation of the Free Church of Scotland. It had its justification in the struggle which had been ineffectually put forth to prevent the corruption of ministerial life at its source, by the

exercise of ungodly patronage. Look at the secessions which have taken place from the Wesleyan community. Does the reproach so often cast upon them belong wholly to those who have seceded, or does it not rest largly with the parent body which has refused to concede the just claims and liberties so earnestly demanded? But this line of thought need not be pursued further. We attempt not to justify all secessions or divisions which have taken place. We are inclined to think that some of them have originated in frivolous causes, and are still sustained without adequate reasons: as movements they have been ruled by ambitious and self-seeking persons, and have tended to the discredit of religion. But we believe that the larger number of secessions have been necessitated by the unfaithfulness, relapses, heresies, or tyrannies of the churches from which they have departed, and they have rendered great service in preserving the spiritual independence and liberties of the people. They have saved nations from the crushing effects of unchecked ecclesiastical monopolies. They have re-acted with healthy influences upon the churches out of which they have been forced. No doubt much can be said in favour of union and its advantages, and there are times and conditions when it can be pleaded for with urgent conclusiveness; but we are equally convinced there are other times and conditions when quite as much may be said in favour of separation, and when the neglect of it will involve the most culpable fellowship with error and sin. The authority of Scripture can be urged in the one direction or the other, according to the conditions which prevail.

It will be observed then from these remarks that we are not inclined to apologise for the existence of the smaller denominations. Without committing ourselves to defend them all, we believe the large majority of them have had sufficient and justifiable grounds to build upon. They have been raised to resist re-actionary and relapsing tendencies, or to give prominence to special truths in danger of being ignored. If we understood the oneness Christ desires amongst His followers to mean their incorporation in one visible ecclesiastical organisation, we should not be free to express these views. If this had been intended then, surely, the framework and features of such an organisation would have been laid down with much more fulness and precision than we find them. But is there an ecclesiastical model exhibiting in all details the construction and machinery of church government? or, has there yet been an organisation to which we could concede a claim to universal allegiance? We hope indeed as the churches grow in spiritual

wisdom and charity, that many of the divisions between them will gradually melt away, and, whether they reach a complete outward oneness or not, that they will be thoroughly one in love, and trust, and hope. But these speculations as to the future we must leave. Thus far we believe that variety of church organisation has been over-ruled for good; denominationalism has served important interests in the past; evidently, according to the present outlook, it will be needful, in some of its forms at least, for many years to come.

We do not, however, care to conceal our impression that the progress of the denominations, and of the smaller ones in particular, will have to be made in the face of greater difficulties in the future than in the past. They are meeting with an increase of resisting influences. For some years back their progress has been slower than formerly. The Moravians, though noted for their missionary operations in other lands, have been singularly stationary in this country. The Quakers, notwithstanding their many high qualities and large pecuniary resources, have undergone actual decline. We do not indeed put these two bodies forward as a sample of the non-progression of the rest. But the more enterprising denominations are progressing at a less rapid rate. We have before us, at the time of writing this paper, only the first of the returns of the new ecclesiastical census in course of publication by the *Nonconformist*, and we are glad to observe that in fourteen towns with populations above 100,000, dissent has gained, in ecclesiastical accommodation, even since the census of 1851, more than the Established Church. Probably the further returns published will show an equal or larger gain in the other towns to be included in the census. The gain, however, of the Free Churches appears of late to have been relatively less rapid. In the rural division of the country we suspect the returns (if they could be collected) would be found less encouraging. It must also be remembered that the *Nonconformist* census refers merely to ecclesiastical provision, and does not relate either to attendance or church membership. Relatively we incline to think that the increase in the former exceeds the increase in the latter. In some of those denominations which venture to offer returns of membership we know that again and again losses have been reported, nor have the late years of advance been equal to years past. The present year the Wesleyans, Baptists, New Connexion, United Methodist Free Churches all report a decrease of members; and the increases of two or three other denominations have been merely nominal. Nor do we think their state at all worse than those of the denominations which, for

reasons best known to themselves, make no returns of membership. We purpose, in reference to the smaller denominations in particular, to indicate some of the elements of difficulty and resistance which oppose their progress, and to suggest such adaptations as will best meet them.

One of the difficulties is in the narrower field of enterprise they have before them, and in the stronger competition which meets them. During the slumbering eighteenth century, in which Methodism had its rise, large tracts of the country were spiritually unoccupied or uncultivated. One of the historical facts which no one now thinks to dispute is, that during this period the clergy, with rare exceptions, performed the few feeble things which were then looked upon as duty, in the most formal and mechanical manner possible; while such was the extent of many parishes that numbers of villages and hamlets were utterly destitute of means of spiritual culture. In the larger centres of population, and in some rural places, dissent exerted a limited power, but over considerable portions of the country it had no existence. Very much, therefore, of the moral field of the country was spiritually unpossessed; the Methodist agents and preachers had it to themselves. It is true that opposition was arrayed against them, and the prejudiced and perverse were irritated by their presence; on the other hand, attempting to meet a need which had been left uncared for, they found numbers who gratefully appreciated their labours. Methodism in its earlier history had these subsidiary favourable conditions to help its success;—it entered many unoccupied spheres of labour, it provided for spiritual wants which had been neglected; it thus laid hold of the sympathies and love of the people, and was able to build its chapels and establish its preaching-rooms with a readiness which seems so surprising. From that time there has been a gradual change in these conditions until now they are largely reversed. Methodism, in its various sections, has penetrated into almost all nooks and corners of the nation, and no longer finds new ground to occupy in the sense in which it did formerly. Of course it cannot be said there is no unconverted population to work upon, but this population is followed by agencies and provisions to an extent which has not before had any parallel. These things are brought to the doors of the people; greater religious facilities can hardly be desired. The places of worship will accommodate far more people than are disposed to attend, and with rare exceptions are convenient of access. Many of the dissenting bodies have displayed great activity and energy in striving to overtake the spiritual

necessities of the nation. The Established Church, also, has been roused from its apathy and stimulated to keen emulation; it is sagaciously utilising, and applying to purposes of propagandism and enlargement the great wealth coming from endowments which have immensely increased in value; it also draws largely from the voluntary resources of its adherents; the result is a most visible and impressive multiplication of its buildings and agents. Of the number then of ecclesiastical means and agents—we will not at present say anything as to their quality—we have no lack. They are in excess of the disposition to receive and improve them; in some districts also in excess of the real need. Now this state of things is in striking contrast with that which existed during the last and the earlier part of the present century. The outward conditions affecting the progress of the religious bodies are now widely different. There has come into play a keenness of competition which renders the progress of any one body more difficult, and of a smaller body extremely so.

The lesser denominations have to meet the strong current of an opposing social influence. The social power at work is now immensely strong. This is an age in which the class of persons who possess leisure and means has abundantly increased. Much time is spent in social intercourse and visits. Those belonging to this class copy each other's ways and manner. Their current of life can only smoothly flow in the channels of common customs and modes. Those who venture to run out of these meet with the friction of social inconvenience and difficulty. Singularity is frowned upon. Restraints, distinctly felt, if not easily defined, press upon independent utterance and action. One of the great dangers which threatens the age is the loss of individuality of life and character. Just as the raiment manufactured is made for the million, and we can only obtain patterns and shapes intended for the multitude, so the social raiment of life is ruled much by the same principle. There are circles in which to be a member of a dissenting body is felt to be an inconvenience; in what are termed the higher circles such a member is rarely to be found. It is true that in the middle-class and lower levels dissent has a social power by which it can protect itself. But what numbers of those who have ascended in wealth and social status, and who have not been fortified by strong convictions and principles, have passed out of its ranks. It is not a new tendency, but one which is now developing itself more powerfully, for people to go where the many go and to do as the many do. Here then is a social impediment which puts the smaller

bodies at a disadvantage, and renders their growth more difficult.

There is also another opposing influence which has been silently and gradually operating, and the power of which we believe to be much stronger than is suspected. In our cities and towns, with a flourishing commerce and a pressing demand for labour, it is comparatively easy to acquire the protection of temporal independence; the coercion which finds its power in an impoverished and precarious subsistence is rarely exerted. The rural districts of the country present a striking contrast to this state of things. For the most part the temporal dependence of the people is extreme. Through the peculiar influence of our land laws—laws which almost all other nations have abolished—the ownership of landed property has been falling into fewer, and still fewer hands. The ancient yeomanry, as a class, is nearly extinct. The farmers who work their own farms are scarcely anywhere to be seen. The smaller freeholds are fast disappearing. Nearly the whole of the soil is owned by those who take no part in its culture. It has therefore come to pass that the rural population is now divided into two classes: one, consisting of a small and select number of landowners, with their close allies the clergy, possessing immense wealth and unbounded temporal independence; the other, the tenant farmers, for the most part tenants at will, and liable to be cast adrift without claim of compensation, with their labourers under them, living in extreme temporal terrorism and dependence. Who cannot see how much the liberties of such a class must be narrowed, and how great will be its difficulty, in such a position of temporal dependence, of sustaining a political and ecclesiastical independence? We have almost ceased to expect it. Experience has led us to anticipate that the political leanings of landowners will be followed by the votes of their tenants. The tenants require no written or spoken mandate to lead them to do this. They are quick enough to read a language which is expressed in deeds rather than words. And just as they have been forced into this political subservience so, to a great extent, are they being coerced into ecclesiastical subservience. There are, of course, many instances in which the liberal views or moral indifference of proprietors ensures to tenants greater liberty of conscience, but if saved from the interference of superiors they are often exposed to the vexatious annoyances of subordinates. The rule, however, is for the landowners and clergy so to combine and advance their aggressions as to seek to bear down opposition, and to bring tenants and labourers under their

own ecclesiastical fold and rule. Of the strong influence of the landowners there can be no doubt. The power by which they can force the exclusion of all public-houses and beer-houses from 1,100 parishes in the province of Canterbury may be applied in many other and much more doubtful directions. The power to exclude beerhouses can be exercised to exclude meeting houses. Clauses can be, and are, inserted in deeds to prevent the erection of dissenting chapels, or the holding of dissenting services in houses; and stipulations even are insisted upon that tenants must not attend dissenting worship. We allow that these are extreme cases; but opposition can work in forms less visible and yet equally powerful. A powerful landlordism and a wealthy establishment are both arrayed against the interests of dissenting denominations, are seeking to arrest their spread and to hasten their decline; and this will be one of the hindrances to future progress, and to that of the smaller denominations in particular.

Another influence, which for some years past has been telling in the same direction, and with accumulating force, is the powerful control which the Established Church has gained over the education of the country generally, and of that of the rural districts almost exclusively. The denominational system has so operated as to favour the wealthiest sect, to extinguish smaller and independent schools, and, apart from the cities and towns, practically to shut up parents to the necessity of sending their children to the schools of the establishment or to none at all. We know how such schools are subordinated to Church of England propagandism, to teach its catechism and creeds, to initiate children in its forms, and to train them to preferences for its service; and further to instil into their minds prejudice toward dissent. The recent Educational Act has in this respect mightly increased the power and augmented the resources of this Church. No wonder that the Tory section of the House rendered such hearty assistance in its enactment. They had instincts and a discernment keen enough to discover in what direction its influence would preponderate. Had Mr. Forster been specially engaged to frame a measure to frustrate the interests of dissent, and to operate with ultimate disaster to the teaching of evangelical truth, we do not see how he could have better succeeded. Let a similar measure be conceded to Ireland and then we shall see to what an extent the national income will be appropriated to the support of erroneous teaching. As to the influence of the present teaching in Church of England schools we quote the following words from the seventeenth Home Missionary report of the

Wesleyan Conference:—"It is to be more than feared that unless in arrangements for national education by the Legislature, or failing that in our church organisations, some wisely devised and practicable plan be adopted by which to counteract and abate the evils complained of, many, if not the majority of the children of our villages will be prejudiced against all evangelical efforts for their benefit; will be enslaved in errors alike destructive of their true welfare, and of their English spirit and sympathies; by errors which will poison their manliness and good sense at the fountain, and which will more than imperil their loyalty to the throne and the constitution of these realms. . . . The identity of Anglican and Popish teaching has recently been conclusively shewn, and the dishonesty of Anglican Ritualists contemptuously exposed in sermons by a Roman Catholic dignitary." These words of a Wesleyan official are decisive enough to indicate the present and especially the future danger which is looming before us. Let the mind of the youth of the nation become darkened and enslaved by pernicious teaching, and not easily can that mind be hereafter reached by true teachers. This is another of the difficulties the denominations have before them, and which, of course, must operate most unfavourably toward the weaker denominations.

But the smaller bodies have not only these external difficulties arrayed against them: they have internal difficulties to contend with, some of which arise specially out of their limited numbers and resources. No one can fail to see that their finance power is feeble. Now, according to existing conditions, money is one of the mighty instruments for promoting ecclesiastical and even religious extension. The masses are little ruled by strong sectarian preference and principle, but place within their easy reach a convenient building, and provide it with an efficient ministry, and to such a place, without much regard to the sect to which it belongs, they can be collected as hearers of the Word. This fact is now well understood and generally acted upon. When the Bishop of London desired to extend the Church of England in the metropolis he organised a scheme, and asked that a million of money might be raised for the purpose. If the whole of the sum has not yet been raised still the amount contributed has led to the establishment of a great number of churches and church agencies. Much has been accomplished in this way among the Congregationalists by the late Mr. Thomas Wilson, and since then, by the united and systematic help afforded by their Chapel Building Societies. When the Wesleyan body

awoke to the fact that relatively it was fast losing ground in the metropolis it sought to recover itself by the establishment of a new Chapel Building Fund, and has of late specially resuscitated and replenished the fund still further to extend its area and power. So the wealthier and more enterprising sects, by judicious and liberal expenditure on ecclesiastical buildings, seek to multiply their adherents and enlarge their resources. They build places of worship, not because they have existing congregations which require them, but rather as a means of attracting and consolidating congregations. Sagaciously anticipating the future, they secure, beforehand, appropriate sites—year by year becoming more expensive—in dependence upon the well-known certainty that a commanding and well-situated building, efficiently supplied, will draw together a self-sustaining congregation. Here, then, is the disadvantage of the smaller as compared with the larger denominations. They are feeble in finance power. Such is the high cost of land and building, in cities and towns in particular, no extension of moment can be accomplished without great money expenditure. This renders the progress of the lesser bodies relatively more difficult to advance.

We can hardly ignore one difficulty which is now affecting Methodism at large, and operating to retard its numerical progress, probably to a much larger extent than is supposed. There is an increasing reluctance to submit to the class-meeting condition of membership. Of this fact we have general and concurrent testimony. At an earlier stage of Methodist history this difficulty had scarcely an existence. There was a willing submission to the requirement. It must be remembered, however, that class-attendance has now a purpose attached to it it had not in the days of Wesley. It was not then a condition of membership in the Church; only of membership in a society which Wesley sought to associate with the Church. While no one expresses a desire to displace class-meetings as one of the voluntary means helpful to spiritual improvement, it is evident, as the Wesleyans find, there is a growing disposition to challenge the claim or rule which makes attendance upon them necessary to church-membership. We are not about to discuss the rightness and wisdom, or otherwise, of this condition of membership—this is a question which lies outside the scope of this paper: we are simply noting it as a sign of the times, and as one of the new elements of resistance to Methodist progress. Probably it excludes many from the circle of membership, who, if connected with other denominations, would be brought within the circle. The outward progress of Methodism

has kept pace with the progress of other denominations. Its chapels and agencies have been greatly multiplied. But when tested by its numerical returns its state appears much more stationary. We incline to the opinion that the average membership is lower in Methodist congregations, in proportion to the number of hearers, than in other congregations. How far has the increasing difficulty connected with the condition of membership we have named to do with this? We venture to say that the condition must be given up, or more sincerely sustained. We believe in none of the Methodist bodies is discipline, in relation to it, now upheld. The condition, in many cases, is practically inoperative after admission to membership has taken place. The result of this laxity is that the law is looked upon as unreal and unnecessary, and the unwillingness to observe it is strengthened. We say that this difficulty affects Methodism at large, but, by reason of the greater independence and freedom they possess, the lesser sections of it in particular.

We have thus, without reserve, mentioned the causes and signs which to us indicate the harder race the smaller denominations will have to run in the future. There are strong currents of ecclesiastical and social influence to oppose them, and for a time at least these currents may increase in their force. Probably we shall be blamed because our line of remark seems discouraging, and exposes rather than covers our weakness; but there is no wisdom in ignoring difficulties; their weight and power had better be measured. To remain in ignorance of them, or to refuse to consider them, is to be exposed undefended to all their oppressive and weakening influence. They must be met by the wisest adaptations and most conserving means which can be provided. We offer a few suggestions to serve this purpose, to some extent general in their application, but bearing more directly upon the Methodist New Connexion, the denomination with which the *Methodist Quarterly* has been more particularly associated.

It is important that the weaker ecclesiastical bodies should use means to strengthen a warm and intelligent denominational attachment. Far be it from us to advise the inculcation of a narrow and bitter sectarianism. We grieve to see either a large or small body shut up in its own exclusiveness, and so puffed up with its own superiority as to treat with shyness and disdain those belonging to other ecclesiastical folds. This has been carried so far in some cases as to dry up all that is generous in social and political relationships, and to create

frigid reserve even in the ordinary intercourses of life. Nor do we rejoice in the multiplication of sects as such: the establishment of no sect can be justified unless to sustain some important principle or interest which cannot be otherwise upheld. We should be glad, indeed, on equitable terms, to see the existing number of sects diminished. Let such of them as have no sound and sufficient reasons for separate existence allow the existence to die out. Now we are free to offer these remarks, and yet to plead for the deepening of intelligent denominational preferences. Of the many sects which exist is it not desirable that persons should understand why they are attached to one rather than another? Is it enough for them to say that they are members of a sect because their ancestors belonged to it, or that they have been educated in it, or that mere association identifies them with it? If persons can base their preference on no deeper grounds than these, then it is comparatively easy work to displace it. Let persecutions frown upon them, or temporal and social advantages entice them, and they can be soon moved from their steadfastness. The only way by which an unfluctuating, permanent denominational attachment can be created is by a clear inculcation of those principles for which a denomination, as distinct from other sections of the Church, specially exists. If there be confidence in the righteousness and importance of the principles then sufficient prominence and repetition should be given to the teaching of them. This course is specially needful with respect to the smaller denominations, subject as they are to so many weakening influences. So soon as the members of an ecclesiastical body lose appreciation of that which is distinctive in its constitution, they will fall off in their allegiance to it, and their union with another body will become comparatively easy. We will avow our impression, with respect to our own community, that of late years there has been culpable negligence of effort to create intelligent denominational preference. We have had such a profusion of charity—we have been so afraid of raising features of comparison which might seem to reflect upon other communities—we have been so sensitive lest by touching controverted points we might give offence—that we fear we have numbers growing up amongst us who have only a superficial knowledge of our history or principles, or of anything distinctive about us as a community. We hold there is no reason to be ashamed of the two great principles upon which our community, as one of the denominations of Methodism is built; there is as much reason to admire them to-day as in 1797. These principles are:—the justice of dissent

from the Church of England; the Scriptural right of the laity to be associated with the ministry in church legislation and discipline. Has the time come when these principles should be renounced? The necessity for them is more urgent. The vast transition rapidly proceeding in the Church of England from Protestantism to Popery calls for dissent more loudly than ever; all the lessons of Methodist history, all the present signs of Methodist development, teach the wisdom as well as the right of the claim of the laity to share with the ministry in church rule. Of course those who think lightly of principles of church government will affect contempt for this line of remark as savouring of bigotry and as marked by narrowness. The root of our difference with such persons is that we believe in the importance of such principles. We believe it to be an objectionable principle that the State should rule a church. We believe it to be a pernicious principle that the clergy of a church should be allowed uncontrolled and irresponsible power. It is because so much of this power is now lodged in the hands of the clergy of the Church of England; because its congregations are deprived of the liberty of local self-government, and are neither able to appoint ministers nor in any way to effect their removal; that the perversion of this Church to Popery is now so notoriously and largely going on. If the laity could have exerted their just influence we believe this process would have been checked in its incipient development. The hope we have concerning the disestablished Church of Ireland rests upon the influence—liable we know by the voting arrangements to be unfairly neutralized—given to the laity. We are inclined to think it would not be a difficult task, to a considerable extent, to trace the corruptions of Christianity to unjust principles of church government—at least such principles have given a shelter to corruptions when otherwise they would have been speedily eliminated. For two reasons, then, we urge that denominational distinctions should be clearly understood, and that just and liberal ecclesiastical principles should be taught: first, this instruction will work against sectarian narrowness and jealousies, and will tend to withdraw support from divisions which rest upon frivolous causes; second, it will tend to weaken such class-rule and monopolies as lead to oppressions and corruptions, and the substitution of the commandments of men for the teachings of Christ.

One of the means of creating healthy denominational attachment, and of rendering other manifold forms of service, is the employment of the press. We need not dilate upon the power of the press; in these modern times the pen is one of the

mightiest instruments of influence. In relation to all principles, particularly those just or conventional restraints exclude from the pulpit, the most effectual medium of diffusing and defending them is by the press. It is of vital moment to denominational life and progress, especially to those bodies numerically weak, that organs should be established for the circulation of intelligence and the discussion of matters denominational in their character. By the general newspapers the weaker bodies are ignored. The only reference we remember any of the London dailies to have made to the Methodist New Connexion was in a brief editorial, which condemned the Popish narrowness, and made fun for its readers by exhibiting the ridiculousness of the rule, which requires a preacher, before publishing a circular or pamphlet, to submit it to the judgment of the Annual Committee. The Church of England, the Roman Catholics, are recognised, and can largely command the columns of these papers to report their proceedings, and to convey far and wide the utterances of their distinguished men; two or three also of the larger bodies of Dissenters have now an abridged space allowed them; but the smaller bodies, for the most part, are left unrecognised or thrust into obscure paragraphs. We are not urging a complaint of injustice; we simply point to a fact. The proprietors of the daily press, even supposing them to be free from ecclesiastical bias or prejudice, must look to the bulk of their readers and provide for the wants and tastes of the many. What is the lesson this fact should teach to the smaller bodies? They should establish free and independent organs to serve their own special interests and purposes. It may be said they have their monthly periodicals. But these periodicals, for the most part, are official, and are ruled in their treatment of questions by official restraint and reserve. They can deal with subjects theological and general in their character, but they avoid discussion of those points and topics which provoke conflict of opinion within the bodies they represent, and yet awaken the keenest interest. As illustrations of the discreet reticence under which not strictly official publications are sometimes placed, we remember one of the quarterlies accustomed to devote much of its space to the discussion of ecclesiastical principles and topics, and yet during the whole of the struggle involved in the disestablishment of the Irish Church it had not a word to say on the question; and now the more liberal of the Wesleyan newspapers, though acknowledging that the question of lay-representation had "an indefinite but real presence throughout" the Conference proceedings, has since then carefully avoided one

utterance or reference to enlighten its readers respecting it. And if semi-official organs are thus laid under restraint, how much more so the official ones are likely to be. Now the organs which are also required are those which, while governed by a spirit of thorough loyalty towards the bodies with which they are identified, ensure the independent and untrammelled discussion of denominational interests and questions, and assist in guiding immature opinions to safe and wise conclusions. Probably the free criticism and comments finding their way into the columns of such papers would be at times unpleasantly inconvenient to the official and administrative class; but this is a small price to pay if we are only preserved from stagnation. The way to take hold of the mind of a community is by articles clear, decisive, and brief in their character, dealing with subjects engaging present thought and interest, and appearing with moderate frequency of succession. More elaborate articles have their place, and better meet a limited want; but to awaken general thought and interest nothing is so effective as a cheap publication, direct and vigorous in its putting of topics before its readers.

To give this thought a particular application we venture to urge the importance of establishing such a publication in connection with the denomination of the Methodist New Connexion. We are well aware that the independent literary enterprises associated with the body have not so far met with encouraging support. It is not our purpose to suggest any large enterprise. A weekly newspaper might be upheld by the body, but we urge nothing so pretentious. And indeed general news is now so largely supplied by daily papers, which fall almost into the hands of all readers, that a weekly summary of news is looked upon as out of date and useless. Denominational papers are not bought for their *general* but their *special* news. We believe the convenience and tastes of most readers would be better met if they were restricted to the province of denominational progress and interests, and to the discussion of the great ecclesiastical and religious questions of the times. Some of the great movements of the age—such as the Liberation and Educational League Societies represent—have cheap and small organs devoted to their exclusive service. We should much like to see some humble venture made in this direction by the Methodist New Connexion. If an unofficial and cheap periodical could be established, not to displace the official magazine or to be an unfriendly rival to it, but to occupy ground it has not taken up, a great want would be met. Loyally and wisely conducted, used for the advocacy

of the principles and interests of the body, and yet liberal in opening its columns for free interchange of thought, we are convinced such a periodical would diffuse a warm stimulous and render much service. There is one thing of which the body may be assured. If it does not meet the thirst for ecclesiastical and religious intelligence felt by a considerable number of its members, the younger and more susceptible of them especially, they will seek for it in other denominational organs. They will become biassed by the teachings of the papers they read, they will be made familiar with the enterprises and doings of other bodies rather than their own; and, in the undesigned comparisons they will be led to make, the advantage will not appear with the body of which they are members. The result will be the weakening of their convictions and preferences in favour of their own denomination, and their assimilation, in sympathy if not in profession, with other denominations. We write this note of warning in no narrow spirit. Let the members of our churches receive all the enlightenment and liberalising influences which open intercourse with other churches can give them. The result we deprecate is this: that while they feel the charm of the intellectual and spiritual activity and enterprise at work in other communities they should also be chilled by the apathy which neglects to justify the principles and advocate the interests of their own community.

It will be helpful to the smaller denominations if, by offering more adequate pecuniary support, they can secure and retain an efficient ministry. We know it is a favourite thought with many persons that ministers should be superior to the temptation of "filthy lucre." But is it right, where no necessity exists, that they should be forced to endure temporal restraints and privation? There can be no question that where stipends are rigidly kept to the old limits the temporal position of ministers is now greatly reduced. It is universally conceded that the purchasing power of money has considerably diminished. No possible economy can fight against the encroachments of increasing expense. Will any one say that a position involving much temporal anxiety and pain is favourable to ministerial service and power? We know indeed that a strong piety can do much to enable the mind to overcome secular inconveniences and anxieties. But it is none the less a just declaration, that the labourer is worthy of his hire Where a minister has to labour with a people subject to pecuniary inability then he can, with an uncomplaining and even a cheerful spirit, join his sacrifices with theirs. But the burden

of pressure should not be cast upon him in order that other persons may rest in selfish ease, and where the ability exists, as in many instances we are persuaded it does, to render him a liberal support it ought in cheerfulness to be offered. We urge this course as much in the self-interest of churches as of ministers. They cannot alter the law of supply and demand. The selfishness of churches will ultimately have, and deserve to have, its penalty in feeble ministerial service; their liberality will be rewarded by increased ministerial ability and success. We are glad to observe signs of progress in this direction. We believe that what has been done of late by several of the circuits of the Methodist New Connexion, has broken the restraint of discouragement which rested upon many minds, and has infused through the denomination a spirit of increased hopefulness. It may be that some of the circuits may not be able to advance as they desire, but let those which have the ability meet the just claim, and this will diffuse a stimulous and encouragement which will be for the improvement of the body at large.

We will take this opportunity, in connection with this reference we are making to the Methodist New Connexion, to express a few thoughts concerning the administration of its finances. It has been our conviction that the discouragement and partial re-action which for a few years has afflicted the denomination, has been owing in no small degree to the indefinite, ill-conceived administration of its financial resources and interests. We ventured to deal with this subject in an article which appeared a few years back in this organ, and then indicated the re-action of discouragement setting in upon us. The subsequent history of the body has proved the timeliness of the warning. Without sound and steady principles of administration it does not seem practicable for a body, with an itinerant ministry and many dependent circuits, to escape embarrassing fluctuations. Will the members of our committees with whom the management of connexional affairs chiefly rests —for Conference seems more and more disposed to content itself, almost without semblance of discussion, with the formal acceptance of their decisions—pardon us renewing one or two suggestions?

The past history of the Chapel Fund clearly teaches the need of a more prudent restraint in the distribution of its future resources. Its ordinary income has always been remarkably equal, slightly increasing with the increasing number and resources of the body. Though appeals for increased support have been reiterated almost to weariness, and resolutions have

been annually passed to pledge the Connexion to render it, the current of contributions has remained much the same. Should not the fact of an inelastic income have suggested the restraint of a corresponding expenditure? But what took place? The grants from the fund were distributed and promised with a lavish recklessness. By no softer phrase can we characterise the administration. The result was it speedily became loaded with debt. Fourteen or fifteen years back a successful effort was made to throw off this burden, but only to be followed by the same wild process of expenditure, the debt immediately rising to most embarrassing proportions, the promises yet more so, and the ordinary income having to be largely absorbed in the payment of interest. By strenuous effort the fund has again been relieved. We trust that past lessons will not be unheeded. The repetition of the previous course ought to be resolutely opposed. The Conference should lay down definite and fixed principles for the management of the fund; nor should the Chapel Committee have power to depart from them according to its varying impulses and judgment. One of these principles should be that the grants made should in no case exceed a fixed proportion to the sums locally raised. Another that no promises should be made which cannot be redeemed within one or two years. Another that the expenditure in no year should be permitted to exceed the income. It will be well in this way for the committee to be protected from the flood of applications which will be poured in upon them, some of which will be pressed with great importunity. There is no true interest in snatching a temporary gain by drawing upon future resources, and throwing embarrassment upon years to come. Of course it is easy to be generous with borrowed money, and profuse in promises which have not to be immediately redeemed. There is a temptation in cases of strong pressure in this way to secure temporary relief and popularity. Now the principles we have suggested would guard against the weakening of the principles of local self-help and independence, discourage excess of application, protect those entrusted with management responsibilities, and spread the benefits of the fund over a much wider area than has hitherto been the case. But the most important and radical change required in the fund is that its distributions should be changed from gifts to loans. There are few, if any, actual cases of embarrassment. There need not, except by culpable negligence in proceeding with new enterprises, be any in the future. Almost as much relief in the long run would be afforded to circuits by loans as by gifts; and this principle

of working the fund would provide it with constantly augmenting resources. We are anxious that these resources should be economically and reproductively applied, so as to strengthen the spirit of self-reliance in our circuits: we dread the danger, of which we see some signs, lest they should be absorbed by small dependent interests which, no matter how much money be given to them, are for the most part likely to be as feeble in the future as they have been in the past.

One of the causes which of late years has been a prolific source of difficulty to the Connexion has been the excess of its ministerial supply. For a number of years it has had more married preachers than it could accommodate. The consequence has been much discomfort and pecuniary loss to the ministers left without houses; further, the Contingent Fund has been heavily burdened with debt. We will take the liberty, in reference to the excessive supply of young men in the ministry, to repeat a few words from the *Methodist Quarterly*, June 1869:—"We have before said during the last five years no less a sum than £912 has been paid under the designation, 'wife's quarterage;" at the coming Conference this sum will probably be raised to a point not much below £1,200. The present proportion of places for married and single preachers is 88 for the former and 48 for the latter. Who imagines that a proportion like that can be maintained without embarrassment being created?" We notice that the expenditure under the above head has reached the sum of £1,728, and is still going on; the places for single men, to a considerable extent are filled by married men. We hesitate not to say that these losses and difficulties to the Connexion on the one hand, and more so to the preachers on the other, have been needless. They are the result of an inconsiderate, unwise multiplication of single preachers' appointments. Had the Conference laid it down as a principle of administration that the number of such appointments must not rise above a certain proportion to those of married appointments, a painful source of inconvenience and discouragement ment would have been avoided. Probably we shall be accused of treating the affairs of the Church with a frigidly, worldly tone. We reply by asking what has been the issue of the uncalculating and enthusiastic course adopted? A reaction of difficulty and loss. The temporary inflation has been followed by a corresponding relapse. We trust that when the Conference arrives again at a proper adjustment of ministerial supply, it will adopt a principle by which it can be more harmoniously preserved.

o o

We are anxious that the Home Mission Fund should yield to the Connexion more encouraging results. Commenced primarily with the design to assist in the nation's evangelisation, and subordinately to strengthen the denomination, it has so far but imperfectly fulfilled these aims. It has scarcely built up one strong church: it has brought into existence a few feeble interests. These are facts which call for examination and reflection. We are assured if our readers were to analyse the workings of the stations for a series of years, in respect to the expenditure of means and efforts and the results produced, they would rise from the task with a sense of dissatisfaction. It is not pleasant to take this line of remark, but there is no gain in glossing over failures, and refusing honestly to look at them. Evidently the plan hitherto pursued of establishing and working our mission stations has not yielded encouraging results, and the attempt should be made to discover its weakness. Has it not led us unduly to scatter our forces and means? We have sent men to isolated spheres of labour. When the time has come that the small churches they have formed have required chapel accommodation, unable to draw from local resources, the main responsibility of providing it has fallen upon the Missionary Committee. This has led to discouraging delays, or to the erection of small chapels which offer no prospect of accommodating self-sustaining congregations, or otherwise to the building of larger chapels which have acted as a great drain upon the financial resources of the Connexion. Our opinion is that this policy should be reversed. Only to a very limited extent should the Missionary Committee be loaded with chapel-building responsibilities; their province is to provide the evangelistic agency. We had better work in connection with centres where we have strength. Our vigorous circuits where we have financial and numerical strength, and are surrounded by increasing populations, offer the best basis for sustaining aggressive enterprise: an agent working from such a basis is likely to realise more success than if placed in a distant town, where the name of the denomination is almost unknown, and he is received with shyness, and has to work in loneliness. Let the Committee lighten its own responsibilities, stimulate the zeal and utilise the resources and energies of our stronger circuits, by offering them ministers to evangelise localities, and guaranteeing a graduated scale of provision towards their support, on condition the circuits will accept the responsibility of building chapels to accommodate from seven hundred to nine hundred hearers. We have confidence that a plan framed on a principle to stimulate local

enterprise would bring larger gains to the body than the plan, which has been chiefly sustained in the past. Circuits might be found which have been thus worked, where good chapels have been built without cost to the Mission Fund; and by careful and sagacious oversight a similar principle applied to other circuits would result in the growth of interests of greater strength and promise

We are tempted to extend our remarks, but the length of this paper warns us they must be brought to a close. It will be evident that we have dealt with the lower and not the higher aspects of denominational life. We have taken subordinate ground, and have purposely restricted our observations to the material, social, and ecclesiastical elements and influences at work. These elements and influences are increasingly obstructive to the progress of the smaller bodies, and affect them with a strongly disintegrating power. Our thoughts have been stated without disguise, for if a danger exists it had better be understood. We have also referred to some of the subordinate means by which the danger of this disintegration may be withstood. While anxious that all unjustifiable divisions may soon pass away we feel, in respect to those denominations which stand upon good foundations, and are yet required to uphold great principles, that a warmer denominational life and interest should be cherished. Let persons be educated in healthy ecclesiastical principles and preferences, and be instructed to give an intelligent reason why they hold them. If the allegiance of our members does not rest upon the safe ground of intelligent conviction, in these days of strong social attraction, they are in much danger of being moved from their steadfastness. We are free to say all this, and yet strongly to disclaim sympathy with a bitter and narrow sectarianism. Ecclesiastical preference is not inconsistent with an ardent charity. Let the liberal spirit be cherished which can cordially fraternise with all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and which, we hope, before the lapse of a long time, will lead many of the denominations to put away the unjustifiable things which now keep them apart, and bring them into visible fellowship and union with each other.

If we have not adverted to the element of spiritual power as the first condition of denominational success this is not because we underrate its importance, but partly because we have felt it to be more fitting it should have a distinct and separate treatment. This power is vital to the life and progress of the smaller denominations. They cannot exist as mere ecclesiastical corporations. There is a possibility of richly

endowed and doctrinally corrupted sects thus existing when they possess no more than the mere shadow of spiritual life. But with the absence of spiritual power the smaller denominations will speedily collapse: on the other hand in proportion as they become replenished with it their success is certain. All other disadvantages will be as nothing. With a rich baptism of divine influence worldliness, social antagonism, formalism, ritualism, and all other difficulties will melt away. Self-denying earnestness will be brought into exercise, conversions multiplied, and the churches made vigorous and aggressive. The true specific for the cure of denominational feebleness is a genuine revival, deep and broad in its reach, of the work of God. Let this be obtained, and the flush of a brighter future will dawn upon us.

WILLIAM LONGBOTTOM.

ART. V.—THE ALLIANCE AND THE LIBERAL PARTY.

ON October 15th the anniversary meetings of the United Kingdom Alliance for the total suppression of the liquor traffic were held in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester. They were attended by overwhelming numbers, but their proceedings have since been met by such a storm of reproachful criticism as is sufficient to test the power of existence of the most vigorous association in the land. Not that the Alliance swerved from its principles, not that it has introduced any new policy into its operations; but simply because it has declared that it is prepared to act up to its convictions and to declare its principles, not only by the press and on the platform, but, also at the polling booth. The resolution moved by Sir Wilfred Lawson, M.P., was a simple one, and we reproduce it because it will form our text for a few remarks in this paper. It reads as follows:—

"That whenever a vacancy occurs in the representation of any constituency, the electors are recommended to put in nomination a candidate favourable to the Permissive Bill, and the Council of the United Kingdom Alliance pledges itself to give such candidate every

possible support by deputations, lectures, and the distribution of publications. In the event of any constituency being unable to procure a suitable candidate, the Council pledges itself to find candidates, so as to afford every elector an opportunity of recording his vote in favour of the Permissive Bill until the question be decided."

This resolution is the simple and natural outgrowth of the past history of the Alliance. Its name, its professions, and its past conduct, all pledged it to such a course the moment it became safe and prudent to adopt it. It could not evade such a procedure, without dishonour to itself, and danger to its existence. In the history of all great movements there is a time to educate the public mind, and a time to give practical effect to the process of education. There is a time for sowing the seed, and, in due course, a time for reaping the harvest. A society that has not the moral courage to add deeds to words, when words have done their part, and are about to ripen into practice, is recreant to its principles, and must perish in shame. But the Alliance has obtained a high position amongst the public bodies of England, it has received an overwhelming amount of popular support; it received the votes of 136 members of parliament at its last reading of the Permissive Bill, whereas Mr. Villiers' motion for the repeal of the Corn Laws, only received 125 votes, when it was resolved to make it the test question at elections; and the Alliance has been distinctly challenged by the Government to prove its claim to consideration by showing that it is stronger than the publican party. The time therefore has come when the Alliance must occupy a bolder platform, and distinctly announce that it is prepared to act as well as to talk, and that it is ready not only to educate the popular mind, but, the legislative mind as well. The reproach uttered by a well-known political partisan that "the Alliance men are dogs that bark but cannot bite" must be rolled away. No candid mind can regard the whole course of the Alliance during the nineteen years of its history, and then deny that its present policy is simply the consistent and unavoidable outgrowth of its professed objects and principles.

What we say will be admitted by many professed friends of the Alliance who yet urge that it is not safe, or prudent, to make its principle the test question at the present time. The ground on which this is urged is, that the Liberal party will thereby be divided and weakened, and that the settlement of other important questions will be delayed indefinitely. These objections open out two questions :—which is the matter

most pressing for settlement? and, what aspect should the Liberal party assume towards the Alliance movement?

The questions upon the Liberal programme at the present moment are these: the extension of household suffrage to the counties, the revision and reformation of electoral districts, the repeal of the Contageous Diseases Acts, the repeal of the 25th clause of the Education Act, and the separation of Church and State. Now, will any intelligent and patriotic reader seriously say that any one of these questions, or all of them put together, are of comparable importance to the destruction of the drink traffic? By which of these matters are the misery and destruction of human beings wrought? But the victims of the drink traffic may be numbered annually by tens of thousands. Which of these questions may be indicted as the fruitful source of national degradation? But the drink traffic deteriorates our physique, blemishes our civilisation, and counteracts the whole religious work of the country. Other questions are not ripe for settlement yet, the Liberal party is almost equally divided in sentiment upon several of the great subjects we have mentioned, but the drink traffic stands branded before the world with the guilt of spreading incalculable misery and destruction amongst our population. The shortest consideration is sufficient to show that this is incomparably the most pressing subject for settlement, and rightly demands to take precedence of every other matter which claims public attention.

The other question relates to the attitude of the Liberal party and the Alliance towards each other.

Let it be clearly understood at first that the Alliance knows no political party and no religious denomination. Lord Claude Hamilton and Sir Wilfred Lawson, Archbishop Manning and Professor F. W. Newman, stand on its comprehensive platform as fellow workers. It is simply guided by its motto, "the total prohibition of the liquor traffic," and is equally glad to hail supporters from the extreme right and left of political parties. Reproaches have been hurled plentifully at the Alliance, as though it were part and parcel of the Liberal party. It is not so, its supporters are not as such pledged to any party, it does not touch party politics at all, it claims to effect a moral reform in the country, it fights against a foe which is essentially opposed to the highest interests of the nation, and it calls its upholders from every varying school of politicians, and from all the thousand denominations in the land. To the cry, therefore, that it will divide the Liberal party it might turn a deaf ear, because the attitude it preserves

is a neutral one, and it cannot without forfeiting its principles, suit its policy to the convenience of the Liberal, or any other political party.

It is more to the point to consider what should be the attitude of the Liberal party towards the Alliance.

From the moment that Mr. Bruce introduced into the House of Commons the Licensing Bill of 1870, the Liberal pary has been treated by the licensed victuallers and their friends with determined and unrelenting opposition. This opposition was not lessened by the homœopathic measure of licensing reform doled out by the government in the last session. It has been sufficient for the publicans that the traffic has been touched, and its freedom restricted to any degree, to cause them to regard the Liberal party as their natural foe. In revenge they have thrown themselves impetuously into the arms of the Conservatives, and the Conservatives have as enthusiastically embraced them, and bade them welcome. The Liberal party, therefore, must boldly consider its position, and act as its noblest instincts and traditions suggests. Will it, for the sake of holding office, seek to woo back the licensed victuallers by pausing at the first step of the career on which it has entered? Will it make a starting point a stopping place? It must do one of two things. It must appeal to the licensed victuallers or to the temperance party in the country. It may turn to the consolidated drink traffic and apologetically say, "We could not help doing what we did, out of pity for you we did as little as we could; but out of respect to promises made in an evil hour, and because that malignant Sir W. Lawson was peremptory, we were forced to do something; but we will stop now if you will again give us your support." Or it may turn to the party of order and morality and say, "We will not turn back, we will pursue the track on which we have ventured and follow it to the end, until the country is purged of its sad reproach." And if it do this, to the many bright jewels which sparkle in the crown of Mr. Gladstone's Government, one more will be added, brighter and richer than any other. The Liberal party *ought* to deal resolutely with this great subject. It belongs to it in proper order. The very name of the Conservative party seems to exclude it from its management It exists to preserve things as they are, and the proposal of the Alliance is really an invasion of its domain. It might take up the subject and deal with it, but only as it dealt with the question of Reform when it gave household suffrage to the country for the sake of tasting the sweets of office, and enjoying, for a brief period,

the privilege of dispensing places and pensions to its supporters; but even then it would not assume the responsibity of dealing with the subject unless the Liberal party had already adopted it as a cry, and made it a necessity for any government taking office to deal with it boldly.

On the other hand all the traditions and achievements of the Liberal party prompt it to become the foster parent of the movement which aims to abolish the liquor traffic. It is the party of progress; it exists as a Liberal party only so long as it seeks to carry out reforms in which the welfare of the country is vitally concerned, and it *has already committed itself to it.* If therefore the present Liberal party desires to maintain itself in existence, and to deserve the gratitude of the country, let it take up this subject and give it a foremost place on its programme

If it will not do this, what then? Then we fear it must be content to lose a few elections, and perhaps to lose the reins of office. The existence of the present Liberal Government is not essential to the existence of the Alliance, or absolutely essential to the welfare of the country; and if it be indifferent to the magnitude of the evils of the liquor traffic, or if it be moved to arrogance by its past successes, it may be well for it to have an opportunity for quiet reflection to reconsider its programme and the reason of its existence.

It is not likely that any Conservative Government could work any ill to the nation, to a perceptible extent, by taking office for a short time No government can exist in England at present except by the adoption of a truly liberal policy, and if a Conservative Government refused to place itself in thorough accord with the spirit of the day it must quickly retire, and be counted a failure. In the meantime the Liberal party will have learnt wisdom; it will have had the opportunity of looking at questions apart from the golden haze of office. Long continuance in office is fatal to the *morale* of any ministry; it enervates its system; it warps its judgment; it weakens its perception. If the Liberal party therefore has become so dazzled by place and prosperity that it cannot clearly discern those great principles of progress that have made it glorious, the time has come when it needs to learn how

"Sweet are the uses of adversity."

It then requires the free bracing air of "the country," the stimulating tonic of fellowship with its constituents; and the sooner it bids farewell to the lacqueys and officials of Downing-street and rusticates amongst its friends for a little the better.

We may be charged with ingratitude to the Liberal party, and a claim may be set up in its behalf on the ground of the great services it has rendered to the country. And the country is grateful to it; but no nation can afford to perpetuate a ministry in office simply on the ground of past services; it can only be continued because it still proposes to render efficient service in dealing resolutely with the most pressing questions of the day. Let the present ministry do this in relation to the liquor traffic, and it will win for itself blessings manifold from future generations.

If the present Liberal Government refuse to entertain this question it may fairly be charged with ingratitude to the members of the Alliance. Although, as we have stated, the Alliance stands aloof from all political parties, yet its rank and file have given their earnest and unwavering support for years past to the Liberal party. They have won for it many an election and fought for it many a battle. In taking the present determined attitude they lacerate many warm feelings, and prepare themselves to sever many old ties, and they will do it because they dare not but be loyal to the truth; but they will do it with a sad conviction that they deserved better of the friends who have cast them off. A parliamentary election cannot now be very far off, and the lines of battle are being drawn in greater distinctness every day. It is urgently necessary that the friends of the Alliance should take time by the forelock, and seek to arrange for such candidates to be brought out as will pledge themselves to the Alliance platform. This may be done successfully in many places, if done quickly. Let temperance organisations seek interviews with Liberal associations, Nonconformist committees, and other electoral bodies, and represent that in the event of them selecting such candidates as will support the Permissive Bill, they will receive the combined support of the temperance population; and in many a constituency a choice will be made such as will combine several strong elective bodies, and success be thus practically assured.

The time has really come when the friends of temperance and morality must be prepared to vindicate the professions they have long and loudly maintained in the country; and unless they are prepared to stand firmly together, both in municipal and parliamentary elections, we must look for a large accession of strength to the brewing and publican interest in the future.

At the same time we are not strong enough to risk anything by rash ventures or imprudent advocacy. The discipline

of the temperance party must be so perfect as that it will be prepared to enter into a combat and strike with a mailed hand, or to reserve its strength and become mere onlookers while other parties fight out the battle, as circumstances require. In bringing forward candidates care must be taken, only to do so where success is probable, or where a powerful demonstration can be made. To subject a man to certain defeat, or to fight where public sentiment is not ripe for a venture, is to submit the temperance cause to ridicule and to defer its triumph. The party of the licensed victuallers is strongly compacted and thoroughly organised. The temperance party must meet organisation with organisation, and tactics by tactics; but let them be cheered always by the thought that they are fighting on the side of public morality, of social order, and of godliness.

It has not come within the design of this paper to defend the principles or details of the Permissive Bill. For many years now it has been discussed by the public, and our readers are familiar enough with its scope and the arguments by which it is sustained. The principle of the bill is undeniably included in many of the leading measures of recent legislation, and cannot be now excluded from our national system of law. If it be right to give the power of local decision or control to the people as touching lesser matters of interest, surely it cannot consistently be withheld from them when the happiness and wellbeing of the people are destroyed to such an enormous degree as they are by the drink traffic of the country.

W. J. TOWNSEND.

ART. VI.—METHODICAL EVANGELISM.

THERE is reason to hope that the statistics now in course of publication in the *Nonconformist*, showing the relative position of Church and Dissent in our large towns, will be productive of good, apart from their bearing upon the political relations of the Established Church. From these returns it appears that, while the increase of population during the past twenty years has been 42·4 per cent., the supply of the means of religious worship has increased at the rate of 44 per cent. But there are several considerations which moderate the pleasure with which we regard this general result. One is, that whatever may be the deficiency of the aggregate accommodation compared with the percentage of persons able to attend at the same time, the practical deficiency must be considerably larger, as the aggregate of course includes the surplus provision in certain districts. Another is, the number of places of worship in which, instead of the faith once delivered to the saints, pestilent and soul-destroying errors are maintained. A third is, that "although the religious means are not equal to what would be required if all the available population were disposed to use them, the supply in the aggregate, unhappily, exceeds the demand. Probably one-third—at all events one-fourth—of the existing accommodation is not used, and there is not much reason to believe that there has been in this respect any great improvement since 1851." We forbear working out figures which, however accurate, could give only a feeble impression of the reality. Let our readers realise the fact. With humiliation and sorrow it must still be confessed, to use the words of Mr. Horace Mann, that "a sadly formidable portion of the English people are habitual neglecters of the public ordinances of religion." "The common salvation" is unknown or despised by myriads of our countrymen. While locally near to the ministrations of the gospel they are practically as distant from them as if they were dwellers in some dark region as yet unvisited by the light of life. We hail the appearance of this statistical information, not doubting that it will lead thousands of serious Christians to consider anew to what extent they are responsible for the prevailing irreligion, and whether they may not labour with increased activity and devotedness for the salvation of their fellow men. It is obviously not new machinery that is wanted, but more earnestness in the use of

the machinery in motion. The methods and instrumentalities of Christian zeal, which have been found successful after abundant trial, are already numerous, and great would be the folly of aiming to construct any new organisation which should interfere with the steady employment of any means now in beneficial operation. Without, however, recommending agencies other than those that are well known and accredited, we are disposed to think that the working of the churches of the Nonconformist denominations is susceptible of improvement in the direction which the title of this article is meant to indicate.

The question we propose very briefly to consider is whether the aggressive or missionary working of the individual churches, of whatever non-established community, would not be more fruitful of blessing if the range of that working were, to some good extent at least, more precisely defined. We assume that the churches generally are putting forth some evangelising efforts in their respective neighbourhoods; but we have an opinion that such efforts are less extensive and less beneficial than they would be if a more thorough, orderly, and systematic mode of operation were adopted. Both the parochial system of the Establishment, and the system that is common to nearly all the Nonconformist churches, appear liable to considerable objection, but in different ways. We may be allowed to refer to some obvious faults or defects of these methods, as this will enable us the better to describe the plan which we wish to recommend.

The parochial system merits condemnation on the ground of its exclusiveness. We pass over its actual need of progressive extensions and new adjustments to adapt it to varying states of population. We speak of it as a theory. Dividing town and country into sections of manageable extent, it allots a minister to every section, and requires him to take the spiritual oversight of all the inhabitants within its limits. But it does more than this. It restricts the pastoral attentions of the clergyman to his own parishioners; he is not at liberty to extend them to any outside his own district, however usefully he might do so in many cases. And it everywhere virtually excludes, or interdicts, the labours of all nonconforming ministers or other agents. We think the scheme embraces some sound principles, but so far as it is restrictive and exclusive it is deserving only of censure.

But the system which prevails among Nonconformists is also open to objection, viewed as a system of aggression upon the ignorance and irreligion of the people. While it brightly

illustrates the inherent energy and expansiveness of the voluntary principle as compared with the principle of Establishments, the very character and conditions of its success suggest with how much greater efficiency it might be expected to work if its voluntaryism were more pervading and methodical. Its operations are too purely spontaneous and uncertain—too little subject to law and order—and hence its cultivation even of those parts of the spiritual field which it fully occupies is incomplete and unequal, From a charge delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury not many weeks since we quote the following remarks:—

"This mission to the whole nation laid upon the Established Church very great and grave responsibilities, and he trusted all the clergy were labouring with a sincere desire to accomplish this mission, knowing that with any mere congregational system a vast number of the poor come to be altogether neglected; and that if the ministers of the Established Church are not ready to succour them in their spiritual and temporal needs they run great risk of being neglected by all else. Indeed in the existing state of society, when vast masses of population are collected in towns beyond the ordinary means of grace, it must follow that unless the clergy consider themselves as distinctly responsible for the outcast poor, those persons will have no pastoral superintendence. According to the system of supply and demand which exists in non-established churches there would be no demand on the part of the outcast poor, and therefore no supply on the part of the various denominations. He gave the ministers of the denominations credit for their missionary exertions, but the responsibility of this work rested heavily upon the Established Church."

The Archbishop, with many other ecclesiastics, needs to be reminded that what the Establishment aims to secure by its parochial organization and what it effects are widely different things. Although, however, there is much that is erroneous in his representations, we cannot deny that there is in them a measure of truth. The mere congregational system provides only indefinitely with whatever bountifulness for the religious wants of the neighbourhood in which it is established. Within a given boundary it may convey the lessons of Divine truth to every home, or it may overlook a number. Its operations, when most vigorous and most comprehensive, are unregulated and precarious. There is nothing in it to ensure that all the inhabitants of a place, without exception, shall have the benefits of redemption persuasively offered to them.

Now would it not be practicable and expedient to combine the excellencies of these systems, getting rid at the same time

of their imperfections? Would it not be practicable, at all events, in respect to our town populations? Why should not the various churches of nonconformity in any of our great towns, without imposing and without submitting to any restraints or prohibitions, arrange to take charge each of them of a well defined district, and to bestow upon it in its own ways an all-comprehending cure and culture, so that not a family keeping aloof from gospel ministrations should be left without oversight, as sheep having no shepherd? Our recommendation is, in other words, that Dissenters should make a trial of the parochial system minus its exclusiveness, on which its value in no degree depends. This principle of locality, as Dr. Chalmers used to call it, this territorial occupation of a neighbourhood by a church is fraught with advantages which Dissenters should not allow themselves to undervalue because of any evils that have been accidentally associated with its working. Let us not be misunderstood. We are pleading for an arrangement by which a church shall bind itself to attend to all the missionary work which may be demanded within certain limits, but not so as to forbid or discourage any ministers, or members of other churches, from assisting in the work as providential occasions may invite. We would rear no barriers, impose no prohibitions. Nothing is farther from our thoughts than an attempt to confine Christian sympathy and effort within hard and fast lines. Let all use unfettered liberty in trying to save souls from death. The minister must be left free to visit hearers wherever they dwell. The Sunday School teacher must be encouraged to go to the homes of his scholars within whatever boundaries they may stand. The relations of kinship, the ties of acquaintance and of worldly business, and other modes of connexion, open to particular Christians doors of access and sources of influences they are bound to improve, irrespective of locality. As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men. But local nearness, the circumstance of neighbourhood, is itself a species of benevolent opportunity which would, we think, be best turned to account by the territorial method of operation now proposed.

If this plan should secure the cordial approval of most of the Free Evangelical Churches in any of our populous towns, there could be no difficulty; we can see none in those churches through their ministers or others treating with one another on the business, entering into agreement about the parts which they should severally perform in the promotion of the common object, the bringing of them that are without under religious

means and influences. But it will be seen that any religious society may adopt the principle without waiting for others to concur. We refrain from going into matters of detail in relation to the method, leaving our suggestions to ripen and bear fruit if they have any practical value, according to a higher wisdom than our own.

T. D. C.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By GEORGE STEWARD. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1872.

APART from its intrinsic merits, this work will be of great interest to many. It is a posthumous production, edited by the wife and daughter of the deceased, and containing Mr. Steward's last papers, intended by him to be a sort of sequel to his other work entitled *Mediatorial Sovereignty.* The state of preparation in which the papers were left not only warranted their publication, but we think it laid his friends under an obligation to publish them. The discussion of the teachings of the Epistle is only carried on to the twenty-second verse of the tenth chapter; but, as the argument of the writer terminates there, the author justly considered his work as virtually finished. An addenda, however, is given, compiled from sermons and from notes of Scripture readings preserved by his wife. These carry on the exposition to the end of the Epistle, and will be found, as the editors hoped they would be, suggestive and interesting.

Mr. Steward's method of intellectual effort was very singular. We are told he put nothing upon paper until the whole scheme was clearly brought out in his own mind. He then dictated deliberately but continuously, rarely recalling so much as a word, the sentences dropping from his lips with wonderful completeness. But he gave his amanuensis no hint of chapter or paragraph, and left even the punctuation to her own perception of the meaning. When the dictation was finished, the whole was subjected to an unsparing revision. In the case of the present volume this revision was never made, and the responsibility of it devolved upon the editors. They have deemed it best to leave the MS. intact.

This volume will be very acceptable to the author's friends and admirers, still its merits are such that we trust its circulation will not be kept within their limits. No one can look over its pages without receiving the conviction that Mr. Steward was "mighty in the Scriptures." He handles them as a master in Israel. He has so made them his delight, has so studied them with a clear and deep insight, has so firmly grasped their meaning, and can so explicitly state it in his expositions, that they become spirit and life to us, are pregnant with the power that makes us wise to salvation through

faith in Jesus Christ. That portion of the argument which deals with the Sonship of Jesus is worthy of special attention for the clear and correct conception of Scriptural doctrine respecting it which it contains, and the instructive way in which its relation to the whole mediatorial system is stated. We give one brief extract illustrative of the theological excellence of the work.

"The whole case may be said to turn upon this,—*whether the moral relations existing between God and His creatures are expressed, and, as it were, exhausted by law and its offices alone; or whether the perfect programme of government admits of any reserve of anything above and beyond this dominion of law.* On the affirmation or negative of this question the doctrine of atonement is decided. Should we receive implicitly the testimony of Scripture on the point, it is decidedly affirmative, and nowhere more explicitly than in the tenth verse. 'For it became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.'

"This language is express, since it testifies that all religious systems, be they what they may, or views of Christianity not founded in atonement, are out of harmony with the character of God; they are unbecoming, at variance with it, and consequently essentially false. On the contrary, this very doctrine of atonement is in harmony with it; and this harmony is to be progressively developed, and consummated when the purpose of 'bringing many sons unto glory' is accomplished.

"Beyond the views of God which Law is adapted to express, we admit two of kindred glory, fatherhood and prerogative:—the one the foundation of life, as it is of love; the other of rule, modified in accordance with it, and with the intent not of superseding but of augmenting the glory of Law itself. Fatherhood is the fount of atonement, as it is also of prerogative. The Atonement is therefore the issue of sovereign love, which, nevertheless, cannot express itself but in perfect keeping with government, as determinable by Law. Such is, briefly, the view of this question on the higher side.

"The basis of atonement is therefore twofold: (1) Grace or prerogative; (2) Law, as the organ of government. On this showing, the *divinity* of the Son as the author of atonement, is an absolute pre-condition. Mere humanity can express nothing beyond the range of law, place it where you will; another and higher power can alone give expression to that sovereign love on which atonement depends. The reach of such a Being extends to the infinite; He can pass the realm of mere creature agency, yet, in combination with it, is able, by means of an atonement, to develope these reserved glories of the Godhead in a sublime and all-perfect system of human redemption."—pp. 78-80.

"By 'the power of death' we understand something distinct from and indescribably more terrible than death itself: that death, as the result of sin, is but initial; that it opens the gate to the realm of penalty with respect to the soul; and that its true power lies in the relation to what comes after it, not in the thing itself. . . . The 'power of death' here, then, is to be understood as descriptive of the empire of penalty, to which death, itself a penalty, stands in close relation. We are assured that the Atonement breaks this relation between death, physically considered, and its unseen train of penal evils. Instead of being the *first* it is now the *last* enemy to a man redeemed, and there is nothing held in reserve, no purgatory impending over those who 'die in the Lord.' 'To destroy him that had the power of death' means to break in upon his death empire, so that the stream of departed spirits may take another

road, and, instead of replenishing that fearful region, may be transferred to the bright realms of His sceptre, who endured death for our redemption."—p. 83.

Apologetic Lectures on the Saving Truths of Christianity. Delivered in Leipsic in the winter of 1866. By C. E. LUTHARDT. Second edition. Translated from the third German edition by SOPHIA TAYLOR. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

IT will be understood by our readers that the lecturer is a Lutheran minister; but, excepting two paragraphs on baptism and the Lord's Supper, we find nothing in the book but what is in harmony with methodistic theology. The closing lecture, we confess, disappointed us a little. But of necessity it is a mere outline, which would require a large volume to properly fill up; and if to some of his prognostications we should be inclined to demur, yet how few of us see eye to eye with regard to the "Last Things" of the Christian dispensation. Of the book as a whole we must speak in the warmest terms. The perusal of it has been to us a quickening and refreshing exercise, and if our advice is followed no student, or minister, or religious inquirer, who may read this notice will long remain without a copy in his possession. An acquaintance with it must lead every Christian to hold his faith with a higher intelligence and a firmer grasp.

The subjects embraced in the course are—The Nature of Christianity—Sin—Grace—The God-Man—The Work of Jesus Christ—The Trinity—The Church—Holy Scripture—The Church's Means of Grace—The Last Things. This enumeration shows that no truth strictly distinctive of Christianity, or to which we can legitimately apply the epithet saving, is omitted; while a well-compiled index will aid the inquirer's reference to any particular topic. To each lecture is given a valuable collection of notes.

Professor Luthardt's lectures are apologetic in the best sense of the word. He speaks with the conviction that he is set for the defence of the gospel, and his work is done in a most admirable spirit, as if he had in constant remembrance the Apostolic admonition, "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves."

The Pillar and Ground of the Truth. By DANIEL MACAFEE. With preface by Rev. W. ARTHUR, M.A. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 66, Paternoster-row. 1872.

THIS also is a volume on the fundamental and saving truths of

Christianity, which are, however, discussed in a different manner by Mr. Macafee to what they are by Professor Luthardt. Yet each writer has an excellence of his own, which need not be either disparaged or enhanced by comparison. The sermons comprised in this volume are a kind of memorial of the pulpit labours of one of Ireland's most effective Methodist preachers. They are twelve in number on Christ's pre-existence—incarnation—temptation—transfiguration—atonement—and the consummation of His Mediatorial Kingdom; also on predestination—Christian adoption—final perseverance—and the righteousness of God:—the righteousness of the Divine nature, and the righteousness which comes to man by faith. The characteristics of these discourses are fulness and solidity. As Mr. Arthur remarks, they present a striking contrast to the slight sermonizing popular at the present day. "A newspaper article scarcely differs more from the papers of learned societies than many favourite volumes of modern sermons from these." This may, no doubt, repel some readers; but it will attract others we hope, those for instance whose souls long to drink a deeper draught than the shallow goblet of a modern sermon will supply; while young preachers, by a perusal of them, may "invigorate their own thought and utterance, their knowledge and faith, their conceptions of Divine things and of human destinies, so as to contribute more to the power of their ministry, and the hopeful joy of their closing days." Alike for the sake of the author and the intrinsic worth of the volume, it ought to find a place in most Methodist libraries, whether domestic or congregational.

A History of the Christian Councils, from the original documents, to the close of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. By the Right Rev. Charles J. Hefele, D.D., formerly Professor of Theology in the University of Tübingen. Translated from the German, and edited by W. R. Clark. Second edition, revised. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1872.

English students of Church history will be grateful to the publishers for placing this volume within their reach. The author says, "no portion of Church history has been so much neglected in recent times as the Councils. With the exception of a few monographs on particular synods, nothing of importance has appeared on this subject in our days." He has been employed for a good many years in the com-

position of a *History of the Councils of the Church*, which should be of a comprehensive character, and founded upon original documents; and he affirms that he has spared no pains to secure accuracy, and has done his best to consult all the literature which bears upon the subject. The translator and editor asserts that the hopes thus expressed have been abundantly fulfilled, and that he has supplied an acknowledged want in a manner which leaves little to desire. When first he undertook the work of preparing the history for English readers, he intended to add a number of notes from writers who regarded the subject from a different point of view. This he afterwards found to be unnecessary. Dr. Hefele is so fair in the statement of facts that every reader may very easily draw his conclusions for himself.

This volume brings the work to the close of the Council of Nice, but with the editor, we hope the interest manifested in it will induce the publishers to carry it forward.

The Interpretor, or Scripture for Family Worship: being selected passages of the Word of God for every morning and evening throughout the year, accompanied by a running comment, and suitable hymns. Arranged and annotated by C. H. SPURGEON. London: Passmore and Alabaster.

THE industry of Mr. Spurgeon is something marvellous. Whether he is acting wisely in being in labours so abundant may admit of question. His own experience may teach him that the strongest brain may be overworked. But change of employment and not cessation from it is his method of taking rest, hence the work we now introduce to our readers. "I have performed," he says, "this labour between the writing of two volumes of the 'Treasury of David,' as a relief to my mind from the severer study which that work involves. Variety of labour is recreation."

The object of this new undertaking is to promote the observance of family worship. But this is not done by supplying a family prayer-book; his conscience will not allow him to do that. "To some the use of forms of prayer appears to be lawful; as I cannot coincide with that opinion it would be the height of hypocrisy for me to compose prayers for the use of others." We are sorry Mr. Spurgeon partakes of these scruples of conscience, for we believe that to have added prayers would not only, as he says, have greatly increased the

sale of the work, but also its usefulness. No doubt he is acquainted with the "Verses on Forms of Prayer against Dr. Watts, who made Forms of Praise," by Samuel Wesley, jun. We should like to see how his logic would deal with Wesley's argument.

> "Form stints the spirit, Watts has said,
> And therefore oft is wrong;
> At best a crutch the weak to aid,
> A cumbrance to the strong.
> . . . . . .
> E'en Watts a form for praise can choose,
> For prayer who throws it by;
> Crutches to walk he can refuse,
> But uses them to fly."

What are most of the hymns Mr. Spurgeon has provided for each exercise of worship but prayers in metre? Still if prayers in prose are wanting to give in our idea completeness to this work, so far as it goes, it is admirably conceived and as admirably executed.

The book, when finished, will contain the gist of the entire Bible, the passages omitted being epitomized when possible. The plan is to take a passage from the historical Scriptures, and add to it an appropriate psalm, or a corresponding or illustrative portion from the New Testament. Through both brief explanations or comments are interspered where they are deemed necessary, or may be useful, spiritual benefit always being kept in view.

We heartily commend the work to all heads of households. For the convenience of purchasers it is issued in parts, one shilling each.

The Biblical Museum; a collection of notes Explanatory, Homiletic, and Illustrative of the Holy Scriptures, especially designed for the use of ministers, Bible-students, and Sunday school teachers. By JAMES COMPER GRAY. Vols. III. and IV. London: Elliot-Stock. 1872.

THESE volumes bring this admirable work to Philemon; another volume will complete the New Testament. We have before expressed our high appreciation of the excellence of this work. The present volumes appear to be in every respect equal to their predecessors. Sunday school teachers who wish to qualify themselves for the efficient discharge of their duties cannot do better than place the whole series on their shelves to be consulted as occasion may require.

The Dream of Pythagoras, and other Poems. By EMMA TATHAM. Fifth edition, with several additional Pieces, and Memoir by the Rev. B. GREGORY. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 66, Paternoster-row. 1872.

FOR gifts and graces Miss Tatham was an extraordinary character. When quite a girl she gave startling proof of high intellectual power and poetic inspiration. Indeed she was born a genius, and we would almost say a Christian, for when a child she had not only strong religious feeling, but her mind seemed intuitively imbued with Christian sentiment and principle. Like many others of her class she had a brilliant but very brief career. At the age of 25 her race was run, and she truly passed "through death triumphant home." Among her last utterances were:—"The valley is not dark. Jesus is with me. *This* is the HAPPIEST time of my life. Is *this* dying? Death has *no* sting for me! Christ has taken it away. Glorious! glorious! glorious! Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly? I think I shall die without much pain; but if not, His will be done. I have not a single fear; it is all joy.

We need not characterise Miss Tatham's poetry. We fully concur with her biographer when he says her "productions are such as lovers of the truth as in Jesus should not willingly let die." There is also, in many of her songs, a mountain majesty of idea—a magnificent expression of thought—a purity, precision, felicity, and force of expression; and, above all, an outgushing fulness of intense and universal charity, which should endear them to all who have a feeling for the true, the beautiful, and the good."

One word respecting the biography. It is beautifully written, and worthy of being associated with the exquisite remains of her whose memory it seeks to perpetuate.

The volume is elegantly got up, and a more acceptable gift-book for a young lady of cultured mind and literary tastes will not easily be found.

Memoir of Mrs. Benjamin Agar, of York. With extracts from her diary and correspondence. By LUKE H. WISEMAN, M.A. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 66, Paternoster-row. 1872.

THIS little volume is a worthy record of the life of a truly Christian woman. Though the child of worldly parents she was brought under

religious influences when about twelve years of age, through attending a prayer meeting. From this time she took every opportunity of attending Methodist services. This caused great annoyance to her parents, and frequently she was sent supperless to bed because she had been found attending the meetings of the sect which, in those times, was everywhere spoken against. Domestic opposition, however, failed of its object. Within a few days of being thirteen years of age she received her first class ticket, which was a "note on trial," and which bore the appropriate inscription, "O that Thou wouldest bless me indeed, and that Thou wouldest keep me from evil." This devout wish was abundantly verified in all her future life, extending as it did over the long period of seventy-one years.

To maidens and matrons alike we commend this instructive and edifying biography. Those young women who are placed in circumstances where religious principles and wordly interests appear to clash, may learn from Mrs. Agar's early life a useful lesson. It clearly illustrates the truthfulness of our Lord's assurance, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." As human prudence would estimate matters, she suffered the loss of many things for Christ's sake, but eventually she received in return a hundredfold, and now she is in possession of life everlasting.

My Class for Jesus. Records of Labour and Success in Sabbath School Teaching. By LILLIE. Edited by REV. J. S. SPENCER. London: Elliot-Stock. 1872.

THIS is a delightful little book, and we should be glad for it to get into the hands of all Sunday school teachers, especially those of the sex of the writer. If all laboured in this department of Christian usefulness as she did, so many would not have to complain that they labour in vain.

Romance without Fiction; or, Sketches from the Portfolio of an old Missionary. By HENRY BLEBY, Superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions in the Bahamas. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1872.

THESE sketches, the author tells us, are not tales of fiction. All the persons mentioned in them were real actors on the stage of life; and all the events described were veritable occurrences. They are written

with considerable power and eloquence, and in the interest of the missionary cause, the volume should be placed on the shelves of every Sunday school library.

The Methodist Visitor. Vol. I. Elliot-Stock.

THIS cheap periodical is intended for all branches of the Methodist family, and supplies excellent reading for spare moments. We shall be glad to find that there is amongst the Methodist denominations sufficient catholicity to sustain such a publication.

Sunday School Management. BY W. J. TOWNSEND. Price one penny. 4, London House Yard.

THIS tract is worthy the attention of those interested in the efficient conducting of Sunday Schools.